The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JULY 31, 1902.

The Week.

The Cuban Secretary of Agriculture, Señor Terry, having made arrangements with certain bankers to furnish a loan of four millions for the relief of the planters, recently applied to the Cuban Congress for its authorization. Instead of granting it to him at once, the House is now proposing to make the loan one of $35,000,000, with a view to paying off the Cuban army. This question has been a stumbling-block in the path of the new republic from the start, and is one which must cause President Palma no little anxiety until it is finally disposed of. Meanwhile it is very doubtful whether such a large loan could be placed by the republic, and the outlook for the planters, large and small, is as hopeless as ever. The first serious failure, reported last week, was that of a large cattle dealer. Fortunately it has not, as yet, been followed by others, but the anxiety at Havana and the general prostration of industry and business continue. For all of which, it must not be forgotten, the blame rests squarely upon the Republican majority in Congress.

Newspaper gossips have had much to say of late in regard to the future of Gen. Wood. Last week it was solemnly announced that he was to head the Panama Canal Commission. Now that this rumor has been authoritatively denied, it is stated that he is to become the head of a "commission to reorganize the army." This story is plainly as unfounded as the other. The army has been reorganized under the direction of Secretary Root, and there could be no possible excuse for such a commission as is suggested. What Gen. Wood's friends must wish for him is a chance to learn a little something about his profession, that he may be worthy of the high rank to which he has been promoted. Until the war with Spain, it must be remembered, Gen. Wood was a doctor. While Governor-General of Cuba, his duties were purely administrative and of a civilian character. With the exception of his service with the "Rough Riders," which lasted exactly sixty-one days, and his pursuit of Geronimo when attached to Gen. Lawton's column, Gen. Wood has had absolutely no military training or experience. His trip to Europe has been arranged that he may learn something about foreign military methods. He himself will be very much of a curiosity when he appears on the German parade grounds.

The committee appointed in April to look into the evils connected with military operations in the Philippines have printed an open letter to the President which is frank if not complete. Messrs. Adams, Schurz, Welsh, and the other gentlemen composing the committee were bound to acknowledge, as they do handsomely, that the situation has greatly changed since the date of their appointment. The President has had something to say, in the interval, and has confirmed his emphatic words by appropriate action. This could but be gratifying to the investigating committee; and, in fact, they do give Mr. Roosevelt praise for having done what he could for "the reëstablishment of the national prestige and the restoration of the morale of the army." This is the general attitude. The committee, however, urge further action in certain "concrete cases," as to which they are unfortunately vague. They allege, that is, the commission by men in the United States uniform of the crimes of kidnapping and robbery, and murder, and torture, and rape, but without specifying either the number of instances or the proof, though they state their entire readiness to produce it on request. Special facts, buttressed by detailed and unimpeachable testimony, were what the occasion seemed to call for; and these we miss in the committee's letter. Nevertheless, we can but praise the temper in which they have performed a disagreeable task.

Vermont for once is having a State campaign on State issues which is full of interest. In the nearly fifty years since the formation of the Republican party, there has never been a canvass when the slightest doubt was felt by anybody that this party would elect its ticket by an overwhelming majority—usually by a vote of more than two to one. This time it seems possible that, a month hence, the Republican candidate for Governor may lack a majority at the polls, although this would only postpone a little his success, as the Legislature, which must settle the matter in such a contingency, will undoubtedly be Republican. Percival W. Clement of Rutland is the man who has upset the State by pushing to the front the issue of a local-option and high-license system as against prohibition, and by taking the field as an independent candidate for Governor when he had failed to secure the regular nomination. Some Democrats have favored the idea of endorsing Mr. Clement, but their State convention decided against this plan by a vote of 254 to 99, and thus removed all possibility of his election. How largely he will detach Republican voters from their allegiance, it is as yet too early to judge, but his candidacy is weakened by the fact that the convention of his own party practically accepted his platform on the liquor question. Mr. Clement complains that the man who beat him for the regular nomination bribed voters in the caucuses, and he urges various reforms in other matters than liquor legislation; but his candidacy does not appear to present that clear-cut issue which is needed to make a bolt successful. However, the disturbance of the body politic which he has caused will do a vast deal of good to a commonwealth that has long suffered from sluggishness.

There is nothing new in the attempt being made in Mississippi to divide the school taxes between the white and negro schools in proportion to the taxes paid by each race. Similar movements have been started in almost every Southern State for at least fifteen years past, but always without success. Strong as has been the race prejudice in many sections, it has never been able to blind a majority of the whites to the fact that the proposition means ignorance and illiteracy for the blacks, and therefore wholesale injury to the South or to the individual State. Now that the negro has practically been disfranchised, the argument that education only teaches the negro to vote against the white man has fallen to the ground. Far more important than this is the fact that the new Southern educational movement has opened the eyes of thousands to the absolute necessity of negro education by the State. The attitude of men like Gov. Aycock of North Carolina, of Hoke Smith, and of many other prominent citizens makes the commission of such an outrage as is again proposed in Mississippi an impossibility. Moreover, in North Carolina the courts have declared the proposed division of the school funds unconstitutional.

The Alabama committee on the employment of children in factories has just published a pamphlet entitled "The Case against Child Labor," of which its chairman, the Rev. Edgar Gardner Murphy, is the author. It puts the facts about this terrible abuse in compact form, and should be in the hands of all interested in rescuing the poor slaves of the spinning-room from a childhood of drudgery. According to Mr. Murphy's statistics, the number of children under sixteen years of age employed in the cotton factories increased 140.9 per cent. during the decade ending in 1880, and 106.5 per cent. between 1880 and 1890. Between 1890 and 1900 the increase was no less than 270.7 per cent. Of the 45,044 textile operatives in North Carolina, 7,996 are under fourteen years of age, while the aver-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

age wage of the child has decreased from 32 to 29 cents per day in that State. In some places in the South the daily wage is as low as 9 cents a day, incredible as it seems, and this for twelve hours of labor! In all, it is estimated that there are at least 22,000 such child victims of the rapacity and selfishness of the Northern and Southern owners of mills in the South, and from 9,000 to 10,000 of these are under the age of twelve. Among the planks adopted by the Texas Democratic convention on July 15 was one demanding "the enactment of a law prohibiting the employment of children under twelve years of age in factories using machinery." This followed upon precisely similar action by the Democratic Convention in South Carolina, and gives good ground for hope that the abuse has reached its worst stage.

Italian emigration to America has become important enough to have its own review, the *Revista Italo-Americana*, the first number of which contains tabulated statistics of emigration for the year 1901. Nothing is more striking in this table than the movement of population which is set down as temporary emigration. Thus, the total number of emigrants for the year was 533,245. Of these, 281,668, according to their own declaration, sought only temporary employment elsewhere with the intention of returning to Italy, while only 251,577 were actually seeking permanently a new home. Of these temporary emigrants 68,250, in the year 1901, went to Austria, 52,563 to France, 45,667 to Germany, 44,383 to Switzerland, and 20,221 to this country. Remarkable is the complete interpenetration of the life of this northern nation by the Italian, and the general prosperity of a class of immigrants which it has been the custom to regard as detrimental. If you wish to have your door-yard tidied up within the suburban radius of any of our great cities, you must appeal to a member of this "backward" race. Ride or drive among the truck gardens to the north of this city, and the language and costume of Italy are everywhere in evidence; not only the smaller shops in this region, but even the saloons, bear Italian names, and the mandolin is commoner than the concertina or other indigenous instrument. Meanwhile your friend is building his Massachusetts summer home exclusively with Italian labor; and your forest camp in Maine, however far from civilization, is not forgotten by the banana man.

The adding of an undergraduate department to Clark University, Worcester, Mass., is, we believe, rather in accordance with a requirement of the founder's will than with the preference of the present administrators. The faculty is a strong, if a small one, and one may assume that the baccalaureate degree conferred under its recommendation will be the equivalent of that of our best colleges. In founding a collegiate department, however, Clark University foregoes its unique distinction as a school of pure research, and, with scantier resources, accepts the conditions common to our historic universities. It is hard to see in New England any pressing need of a new university of the ordinary type, and it is yet to be hoped that the administrators of Clark University may find some special and restricted field of activity, so that the institution under their charge may not become merely a smaller Harvard, Yale, or Brown. It must be assumed that President Hall's ideals for the graduate school of research remain unchanged, and one must hope that, in the altered condition of the university, there may be—in the greater diversity of interests represented, or otherwise—some compensation for a certain loss of distinctive character.

The consolidation of the *Evangelist* and the *Christian Work* is another illustration of the change which has come over the field of religious journalism. A generation ago, the *Evangelist* was the most prominent, influential, and profitable organ of the Presbyterian denomination in the country, and most conservative business men would have considered its purchase on a pretty high valuation a good investment. The fact that its editor was then one of the best-known clergymen in the United States, the Rev. Dr. Henry M. Field, and that he retired from its control some years ago, may be considered one element in its decline; but secular journals which once had famous men as editors and then lost them have, nevertheless, continued to be successful. Moreover, the change in the *Evangelist's* fortunes is not exceptional. It is probably safe to say that there is not a single purely denominational newspaper in the United States which is anything like as profitable now as it was a quarter of a century ago. In New England more than one State organ of the Congregationalists has been merged in the journal bearing that denomination's name which is published at Boston. Elsewhere in the country many of the smaller newspapers devoted to the interests of a single church have disappeared, and there are denominational organs of much pretension which are supposed by the general public to be still flourishing that are known by insiders to have a gloomy outlook.

Lord Dundonald, the English cavalry general who relieved Ladysmith, and who is about to become the head of the Canadian militia, has put forward some interesting suggestions as to the development of close relations between the English and colonial military forces. He is not in favor of the present system of garrisoning the colonies with regiments from the United Kingdom. Like Sir Edward Hutton, he would have each colony raise its own troops and look after its own fortifications, as he believes this would have to be done in the event of a war with a powerful nation. Lord Dundonald is also in favor of giving such high commands as he himself is about to assume to competent colonial officers. Promising military men from any outlying portion of the empire would be given service in Great Britain or India, were his plan to be adopted. But he would always have the colonial officer keep his individuality as such, and not have him enter a regiment like any British cadet. Such a system as he proposes would require an enormous amount of supervision and very heavy expenses in the way of training officers so far from the hub of the empire. But the acclaim with which Lord Dundonald's elaborate suggestions have been received, goes to show how eager the public and the War Office are to take advantage of the close military relations of the various parts of the empire since 1899. Apparently everything possible is to be done to build up an elaborate system of "imperial defence" with great levies of men, no matter what the expense to which the taxpayer may be put.

Wherever the British Parliament wanders, it infallibly comes back to the Education Bill, for the discussion of which the session may again prove too short. But the attitude of the Government has notably changed since last summer, when the tendency was to cram a roughly prepared measure down the Liberal throat. This year successive amendments are bringing the bill nearer to the Liberal way of thinking, and it is evident that Mr. Balfour will make every concession short of the general principle of the bill—namely, that the seat of educational authority is to be not the school boards, but the 338 county and municipal councils. Upon this general matter of educational polity the Liberal adherents of the board-school system will naturally conduct a vigorous opposition. Meanwhile, recent amendments have greatly reduced the offensiveness of the bill, both to the local taxpayers and to those who saw in it an insidious move of the Church of England. The two most important amendments respectively promise to the poorer councils liberal support from the Exchequer, and forbid the teaching of any denominational creed or catechism in all schools supported from the rates. It is needless to say that this is a sad blow to the high-churchly of Lord Hugh Cecil's stamp, and that it will probably relegate the more ecclesiastical of the voluntary schools to their proper status as private institutions. It would seem as if Mr. Balfour had really grasped the idea that public education must be secular, and that only upon this basis

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

can the various primary schools of England be fused into a common system. This is a great advance for a Tory Government to have made.

The Kaiser will perhaps never more completely look the war lord than when, in the coming September manœuvres, he leads 90,000 troops into the Polish provinces of the Empire. In a time of friendly feeling such an entrance would seem unnecessarily spectacular. When the Kaiser makes it in response to a warning to avoid the Polish region, it is a significant reminder that the Empire has the means of enforcing loyalty. Whether such a demonstration is either wise or necessary, is very doubtful. The problem of racial antagonism in Posen and Silesia must work itself out gradually; it cannot be settled in a day by heroic expropriation of Polish land-owners, or through the execution of impressive manœuvres by the army. Such measures, indeed, are likely to deepen the misunderstanding, and it is clearly unwise for Germany to embitter a quarrel in which all the odds are in her favor.

The assumption of a Korean protectorate by the Anglo-Japanese alliance is a step of great importance. It gives check to all ulterior ambitions of Russia in that direction, and it asserts the constructive and aggressive character of the pact so lately made. Taken in its literal sense, it is almost in the nature of a self-denying ordinance on the part of Japan, while, assuming that the attempt to build up a vigorous nationality in Korea will prove successful, it may eventually mean applying to the Far East the policy of buffer states, which has been well tested in European Turkey. It would be strange to find an identical regimen—in either case of British contrivance—applied to both sick men of the East. A minor but a striking feature of the *entente* is the inclusion of the United States with the two treaty Powers as the possible accepter of a Korean loan. How far this is a privilege, financially speaking, may be doubtful; but it can hardly be considered otherwise than as a friendly overture to a nation which, without the formality of treaties, is firmly committed to the doctrine of maintaining the integrity of the Chinese Empire.

Russia is clearly in earnest about her international conference to deal with Trusts, for she has formally invited the English Government, which is considering its answer, so the Prime Minister said in the Commons on July 23. This would make the omission of the United States singular, if not invidious. It was, indeed, hinted from Washington the other day that only the Powers represented in the Brussels sugar conference were to be invited, and also that Russia well knew that we could take no part in European congresses. But it is not merely bounty-grown sugar that the Russian invitation specifies among the products whose "artificial depression" in price by Trusts it is desired to combat. Besides, we *do* have a place now in European diplomacy, where, according to the *Spectator*, we "weigh heavily." We were represented at the Czar's disarmament congress, so why not at his anti-Trust conference? President Roosevelt has declared it necessary to regulate Trusts by State laws and Federal legislation; surely he could not decline to accept the added curb of an international agreement. For our part, we feel almost like demanding an invitation as a right. We cannot let it be believed that we are so much the country of Trusts *par excellence* that it is impossible even to ask us to discuss methods of restraining their evils. If the European nations are to have a banquet of that sort, the United States ought to be present in some other guise than the fatted calf.

That Premier Combes's decree closing some twenty-five hundred monastic establishments would arouse bitter opposition, it required no extraordinary gift of prophecy to predict. Much of the rioting on the occasion of the closing of convents and conventual schools in Paris has been unquestionably of a political nature, but the barring out of the police from proscribed schools by the Breton peasantry shows very clearly that the country generally will interpret the decree as an anti-Catholic measure. There is, in truth, much reason for such a feeling. Most of the schools which have been closed by the recent order are girls' schools, conducted by the various orders of nuns. Many Frenchmen who are not at all of the Clerical stamp will remember that the case of the anti-Clerical Socialist Jaurès, whose daughter recently took her first communion, is not unique in the Chamber of Deputies and will feel that this harsh treatment of the nuns, however technically lawful, is excessive and unjust. On Premier Combes's side it must be noted that the recalcitrant orders are said to be very generally applying for authorization under the Associations Law. Until the statistics of suppressed and of newly authorized establishments are at hand, it will be impossible to tell whether the present proscription can be justified on any such grounds of discipline. Every Roman Catholic country must periodically have it out with the religious orders—history has shown nothing more clearly than this. Whether Premier Combes has not rashly opposed the Church itself, is the challenge he will have to meet when Parliament reassembles.

There is fresh evidence that the system of settling labor disputes in New Zealand by conciliation and arbitration continues to work well. A commission appointed by the Victorian Parliament recently returned to Melbourne after spending a long time in taking the testimony of all sorts of people in all the centres of industry. Only one of the many witnesses disputed the soundness of the principle upon which the new system is based, or desired to return to the old order of things; and among those consulted were the President of the chief Chamber of Commerce, officers of ratepayers' associations, and representatives of various industrial unions. All agreed that the arbitration court works well, but the Victorian commission, like previous investigators, found that the conciliation boards are not equally satisfactory. These boards take evidence and can then send to the arbitration court for final decision on points in dispute. A number of witnesses want to have the boards invested with power to give their recommendations the force of law, until reversed by the court. One amendment of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act is urged which is obviously needed—that seven men in a trade shall not have the right to bring all who are engaged in it before a court, perhaps on the merest quibble or out of sheer malice, but that the machinery of the Act shall not be put in operation unless half the employees petition for it.

In considering this latest picture of industrial harmony in New Zealand, the outsider cannot resist the suspicion that a concurrence of prosperity with good fortune in the first choice of officials to enforce the Arbitration and Conciliation Act has given a successful start in a new country to a system which might work badly in a nation as old and as politician-ridden as the United States. Here is a colony of only 800,000 people, among whom at present there are no unemployed. One industry of some importance is the digging of Kauri gum, much used in varnish manufacture; and when things are quiet in other lines of industry, men can go after gum and earn from £2 to £5 a week. It should be pretty hard for a "walking delegate" to work much mischief in a country where one can earn a good living so easily. As regards the operation of the act, the commissioners note that the Arbitration Court, with which all are satisfied, is presided over by a judge who "seems to be cut out for that kind of work," while "the success or failure of the conciliation boards depends upon the character of their personnel." One of these which is highly regarded has for its moving spirit a man of trained mind and considerable tact, while others have plainly failed because they lacked men of this type.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CATHOLICS AND THE PHILIPPINES.

Archbishop Ireland's statement last week is a sure sign that the Republicans are getting a little nervous lest the Philippine question become temporarily a Catholic question. The Archbishop's relations with their party have long been close. A prelate of high standing and great influence in all the Northwest, he has been one of the few men in the Catholic hierarchy to whom the Republican managers could turn for sympathy and assistance. This he has given on unselfish and patriotic grounds, we doubt not, and as a part of that "Americanism" in the Catholic Church with the movement for which he was understood to be identified until the Pope put it under ban. His activities in public matters have often and perhaps necessarily had a political aspect; and the politicians among the Methodist Bishops have been observed to shake their heads gravely over the spectacle of the Catholic Archbishop of St. Paul being called into the party councils. For them to boast of electing Presidents was a part of their American birthright, but for him—well, it was Erastianism, to say the best of it.

The rôle which the Archbishop now essays is that of a mediator; but we fear that the proverbial cuffs of the peacemaker will be his lot. Certainly his references to the "irresponsible Church societies and newspaper editors" that have been engaged in "movements and declarations regarding religious matters in the Philippines" will not allay the growing suspicion and bitterness with which Catholics in this country have been writing and speaking of what they consider injustice done the friars in the Philippines. To say that this spreading Catholic agitation "does no honor to those participating in it," may gratify the Administration, but it will only infuriate the Catholics concerned.

On the other hand, we can but think that the Archbishop has unwittingly rubbed the wrong way some of the most violent religious prejudices of Protestant supporters of the McKinley Philippine policy. In order to reassure the Catholics, he reminds them how the Administration has "responded graciously to the wishes of the Vatican." Why, that is a veritable red rag—a sleeve of the gown of the Scarlet Woman—waved in the face of those American denominations which have been bred in the belief that the Pope is the Man of Sin, that Son of Perdition. Fully as exasperating, we fear, will be the Archbishop's statement that no one who knows Messrs. Taft and Root and Roosevelt could imagine either of them would "do aught to detach the inhabitants [of the Philippines] from the Catholic faith." What, then, is to be said to the missionary societies which have been enthusiastically sending men and money to Manila? The Rev. Dr. Brown of the Presbyterian Board recently published a missionary report on the Philippines in which he spoke of the field there as one white for a Protestant harvest, the natives having only a "thin veneer" of Christianity, and being ready to repudiate their former religious teachers. Are our Protestant missionaries now to be told, on the authority of a Catholic Archbishop, that their labors in the Philippines are distasteful to the Administration?

We refer to these thickening religious difficulties in the Philippines not to rejoice over them, nor in the hope that they will prove insurmountable. They are one of the evils upon which our Philippine annexationists rushed blindly, though they were warned betimes. This friar question is a part of the legacy of trouble which President McKinley bequeathed to Mr. Roosevelt. With incredible lightness of heart and lack of foresight, our Peace Commissioners at Paris tied up our Government by a sweeping guarantee of the personal and property rights of the very men who had done most to drive the Filipinos to insurrection. That insurrection was going on very well, and was in a fair way to attain its great object in the expulsion of the religious orders; but we rashly bought it, and still more rashly agreed to make good the titles of what Archbishop Ireland happily calls "the landlord religious orders." With that treaty obligation resting upon us, there was nothing for it, if we were to stay in the islands, but some such adjustment as the President and Secretary Root have sought. Their course has been straightforward, and they have done their best to treat the whole question as one merely of government, not of religion. We ourselves do not know of a word or act of theirs in all this business which could fairly give offence to sensible people, whether Catholics or Protestants. They have honestly endeavored to maintain the American principle of the entire separation of Church and State. But religious prejudice was certain to be stirred up by this question of the friars, and it evidently has been, to an extent beyond the mollifying powers of Archbishop Ireland to quiet.

As we hear that our exposition of the legal status of the holdings of the religious orders in the Philippines has set some credulous people wondering if we were going to become cowled churchmen ourselves, it seems opportune to repeat what we have said dozens of times before. The evidence is to us conclusive that the Filipinos do not want the friars restored to their parishes. We are in favor of forcing upon the inhabitants neither religious ministers nor a form of government hateful to them. Purely as a governmental measure, it is much to be desired that the friars do not return to their provincial estates. This we have said again and again. But we have also said that justice must be done, and that our treaty obligations, even though irksome, even when taken upon ourselves thoughtlessly, must not be repudiated. We have, therefore, had no sympathy with those loose-tongued Americans who have said that the friars were a set of pestiferous interlopers who ought to be bundled out of the islands without ceremony; and it has seemed not a little ludicrous to us to suppose, as apparently the whole American press did, that the Vatican would waive, without any *quid pro quo*, and merely to oblige us, so clearly established a legal right as that we had bound ourselves to maintain in the case of the Philippine friars.

THE MINING SITUATION.

The strike among the anthracite coal-miners of Pennsylvania has reached a stage which is without precedent in the history of such struggles. That it has lasted considerably more than two months would alone render it a notable controversy, but what distinguishes it from previous troubles of the same sort is the refusal by practically all the employers to attempt the operation of their mines. There are, to be sure, rumors of preparations to resume work by one of the smaller operators, but the great companies still maintain their attitude of inaction. For the most part their representatives refuse any explanation of this course, although occasionally somebody curtly remarks that they do not try to mine coal because they do not think it to their advantage that they should attempt to resume work.

Meanwhile the price of coal has gone up to very high figures everywhere, and still higher prices are threatened within a week or two. Moreover, it seems clear that, even after the settlement of the strike, the cost of coal can and will be kept far above normal rates throughout the autumn and winter. In other words, everybody who uses coal and who did not put in a year's supply last spring, must suffer in pocket by reason of this labor controversy in the coal fields of Pennsylvania. The worst penalty will fall, as always happens in such cases, upon the poor of the cities, who have neither money nor space to store a large amount of fuel, and who must consequently buy in small quantities. With the steadily growing scarcity of hard coal, the public must also endure increasing discomfort and injury from the substitution of soft coal and the nuisances that follow in its train.

A new question is raised by the existing situation which invites discussion. An ordinary strike in any trade is a matter of only limited concern. If the building trades in Chicago, for example, are "tied up" by a dispute between employers and employed, only a portion of the people in one city are affected. Even such a strike as that of the steel-workers, last

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

summer—important as that vast industry is—did not come home closely to a very large element of our population outside the workers immediately concerned. But coal is a necessity in so many kinds of business and in so many homes that a long-continued suspension of its production means discomfort and hardship to a host of people, from the very mouth of the closed mines to cities, towns, and villages many hundreds of miles away.

The public is deeply interested in the operation of the street-car system in any town. Under the tendency toward consolidation of local transportation companies, a single company in more than one large city practically controls the operation of all the lines. A suspension of operations by that company involves a dislocation of the whole industrial movement throughout the city. A franchise for a street-car line always requires the holder to run cars over it, and the whole right may be forfeited by a company's refusal to furnish the promised accommodations to the public. A strike may break out, and the company may think that its employees have made demands so unreasonable that they ought to be forced into coming back upon the company's terms; but it is legally bound—and it can easily be held to the obligation—without delay to hire new men and set them at work, on whatever terms it can make. The public insists that the street-cars shall run.

The Pennsylvania Railroad is bound by law to transport passengers and freight between Philadelphia and Pittsburgh. Its franchise requires that it shall furnish the public reasonable accommodation in the matter. If all its present engineers, firemen, and train-hands should strike to-day, it would be under compulsion to make every possible effort to man passenger and freight trains with capable new men as soon as it found that it could not make terms with the old ones. The present employees might demand higher pay than the company would feel warranted in paying, but unless an amicable adjustment of the controversy could be promptly reached, the company would have to hire new men as fast as it could find those who could safely be trusted. The public would insist that trains should be run.

The mining of coal in Pennsylvania is of immensely more importance to the people of the United States than the running of the street-cars in Philadelphia, or the operation of passenger and freight trains between the two chief cities of the State. Users of anthracite coal throughout the country are dependent upon Pennsylvania in this matter, which means that they are dependent upon those who operate the mines in that State. To all intents and purposes, people in New Jersey, New York, New England, and other sections have an interest in the normal production of coal at the Pennsylvania mines, quite as real and as vital as though those mines were in their own vicinity. In other words, here is a case where many millions of people elsewhere have a common concern with the residents of the Keystone State.

We suppose that at present neither the State of Pennsylvania nor the general public outside that State has any means of bringing legal pressure to bear upon the great operators who control the mining of coal so that they shall resume production on the best terms they can make with whatever men they can employ. Apparently the representatives of the powerful corporations concerned can refuse to grant the demands of their former employees, and also refrain as long as they like from trying to work the mines with new men. If they think that, in the long run, their own interests will be promoted by keeping the mines closed, starving their former miners into surrender, and breaking up the union organization, there seems to be no legal weapon available for bringing them to terms.

There is one weapon, however, which can be used against them. Public opinion may be brought to bear. The mining of coal should be resumed. The operators ought to man their mines as fully as they possibly can by employing all fit men whose services can be secured. The authorities are bound to furnish them all needed protection, and they should demand it. It will be wise for the corporations affected to heed public sentiment in this matter. The public may not have any legal means of bringing such offenders to terms now, but he knows little of the temper of the American people who supposes that they will permanently permit a small group of men to keep them from having on reasonable terms the fuel which is essential to daily human comfort.

DIRECT NOMINATIONS.

We have received a circular urging in strenuous terms the merits of the direct-nomination system for party primaries. From this circular we learn that an organized effort will be immediately begun to secure the adoption of this system in New York, through an appeal to the next Legislature to enact a direct-nomination law. The movement lends a new interest to the discussion of this subject, which is now attracting wide attention in the Middle West, notably in Wisconsin, where the direct primary is one of the chief issues of the State campaign just opening.

It is quite clear that reform in the method of nominating party candidates is a step which logically follows the establishment of a ballot that is practically honest and a count that is practically fair. A decade and a half ago, practical reformers were devoting themselves to securing beneficial changes in the ballot systems of the various States. In 1888 Massachusetts adopted the secret ballot, modelled after the Australian system, and, in the year following, eight other States enacted similar laws. The two essentials of the new system were secrecy of voting and complete official supervision and control of the ballot. The popularity of the reform was instantly established, and, in the comparatively brief period since this beginning was made, State after State has fallen into line, until now the secret ballot, with absolute official supervision and control, is the rule in almost every section of the Union.

With this reform, wherever it was adopted in good faith, practical purity of the ballot was established. Intimidation did not cease, of course, nor violence, nor fraudulent practices of the grosser sort; but there was no more voting in "blocks of five," and no more wholesale purchasing of votes; ballot-box stuffing became rather a tradition than a practice, and successful trading was rendered well-nigh impossible.

Probably the extreme reformers of those times supposed that, when their end was gained, a free expression of the people's will would result from every election. It is quite easy to fancy them speaking in terms fully as extravagant as those used by the writer of the direct-nomination circular which we have in hand, when he declares that "it is universally admitted that the primary system as it at present exists, is *responsible for all of the political evils found in our municipal governments.*" But when the secret ballot was established, those who had held extravagant views of the results likely to follow were disappointed. It was seen that between the people and a full and free expression of their will still stood the bosses, panoplied with the machinery of caucus and convention. Public sentiment, aroused by exposures of extensive election frauds, had brought about the reform of the election laws. Public sentiment now began to demand supervision of the nominating machinery.

The agitation in this State was quite as widespread and quite as effective as elsewhere. In 1890 the secret ballot was adopted, and other reforms followed, notably the separation of State and municipal elections, by the new Constitution adopted in 1894. In 1898 the demand for the regulation of party as well as of election machinery found its first real expression in the laws of New York, and this was followed by important amendments in 1899, establishing the present system of the open enrolment and the open primary, regulated by law and supervised by legally constituted officials.

Meantime another system, more radical in its nature, was devised in the West, and was enacted into law in Minnesota, with the restriction that it should

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

at first apply only to Hennepin County, which includes Minneapolis. This was in 1898, the same year that we began our primary reform. The aim was to abolish the party caucus or convention altogether, and to do the nominating at the primary. Candidates for party nominations declared themselves at a certain period before the primary. Official ballots for each party, each ballot containing the names of all the prospective candidates of that party, were prepared at public expense. On entering the primary, a voter was handed a ballot of each party. In the secret booth he selected the party ballot which he wished to vote, indicated his choice among the candidates thereon, and returned the other party ballot unused, voting the one of his choice. The law had its first trial in September, 1900.

The result was at the time considered satisfactory, even inspiring. The circular which we have received describes it as an "unqualified success." Nevertheless, a very bad man, as it has turned out, was nominated for Mayor by the Republicans and was elected. It is now alleged that the nomination, even, was obtained by fraud. At any rate, the municipal administration placed in power as a result of the election of that year has recently collapsed in exposure and disgrace. The law was amended by the last Legislature so as to prevent voters of one party from intruding upon the party of another. The direct-nomination system proposed by the dominant Republican faction in Wisconsin is modelled after this Minnesota system. It was strongly advocated, two years ago, when Gov. La Follette was elected, and the Legislature undertook to pass a measure aiming in this direction, but the result was not satisfactory to the Governor, and he vetoed the bill.

As to the worth of the system, it is yet too early to speak with certainty. The result in Minnesota has thus far wholly failed to fulfil the promises of its advocates. As evidence that the people everywhere are demanding with increasing force to be permitted to conduct their government without the intervention of political bosses, the agitation is undoubtedly encouraging. But, granted reasonable safeguards, it must always be true that the spirit of the people is more important than the system. There are some questions about the direct primary which are yet to be answered. One of them is: How could a poor man conduct his preliminary contest for a nomination, with the prospect of another expensive contest for election to follow? Perhaps this and other questions may be satisfactorily answered, and perhaps it may be wise to adopt the direct-nomination system. But even then it must be the spirit and activity of the voters, rather than the system, which will prevent the evils of control by the bosses.

THE HISTORICAL NOVEL AGAIN.

This subject, which has been considered from pretty nearly all possible points of view, receives additional illumination through a recent study, 'A Guide to the Best Historical Novels and Tales,' by Jonathan Nield. Mr. Nield has simply tabulated several hundred historical novels according to the period in which their scenes are laid. Without raising the question whether his table of "best" novels was compiled "somewhere east of Suez, where the best is like the worst," every reader of historical fiction will admit the convenience of an arrangement by which one may see at a glance the periods of history that novelists have chosen or neglected.

Naturally, the novels decrease as the period becomes more remote from the present day, for two reasons: first, the difficulty of finding documentary material in sufficient abundance; second, the complete indifference of the readers of historical fiction to any but what may be called the fashionable periods of history. Thus, it is not surprising to find that the entire pre-Christian era has supplied the setting for only eighteen novels, while the century just elapsed has inspired one hundred and forty novels of the historical category.

The space allotted to each century very regularly expands or diminishes according to the familiarity of its history to the average reader. The early Christians are characters in seventeen novels, a figure that is not approached again until the century which saw the Norman conquest. The low-water mark is the eighth century, which is saved from oblivion only by G. Griffin's 'The Invasion,' 1832, and here we remark that it is most surprising that the novelists have let Charlemagne—favorite of the mediæval *jongleurs*—severely alone, though Mr. Nield really should not have omitted under this head Mr. Arthur Sherburne Hardy's charming 'Passe Rose.' The renowned name of King Alfred carries the ninth century to eleven numbers—a figure which might be considerably increased by the inclusion of novels occasioned by the recent jubilee.

The Middle Ages are reasonably covered by the novelists, though still in a fortuitous way. The twelfth century, for example, has twelve novels, mostly concerning the Plantagenets, while the thirteenth century presents as many as seventeen, but all of appalling obscurity. Chaucer's century comes off ill with twenty-seven items, few of which are readable by any man who values his time or his pleasure. The fifteenth century, with fifty-two novels to its credit, and many excellent ones, is the middle ground between the period where the novel is more or less a waif and a stray, and that in which it asserts a kind of proprietorship; and before entering the very lair of this genre, it should be said that the comparative neglect of the earlier periods by novelists disposes, once for all, of the kindly theory that the historical novel is a passable substitute for history. In every case history is the least of it, and the story is the thing.

With the sixteenth century the historical novel is under full sail, the courses being traced by Scott and Dumas. As the seventeenth century adds gallantry and intrigue to heroism, the figure rises from one hundred and nine to one hundred and seventy. Everybody has had his try at Mazarin and Richelieu, except those who have preferred Buckingham and the Stuarts. In the eighteenth century the Jacobite plots, the American Revolution, and the French aid to carry the index to one hundred and ninety-seven—the high-water mark.

From this dry, but necessary, enumeration it appears that, when we speak of historical fiction, we mean—with a few notable exceptions, including Flaubert, Pater, and Scott—that fiction which finds its subject in the centuries from the sixteenth to the present day, corresponding thus very closely to the periods which historians call renaissance and modern. The reasons for this state of things are not far to seek. It is these centuries which have been admirably treated by Scott and Dumas; and a vast amount of the writing about the Valois, the Stuarts, and the Revolutionists must be set down to imitation, conscious or unconscious, of these masters. It is clear that since these great pioneers the historical novelists have been, in the main, of a very sheeplike habit. They have hardly succeeded, as did both Scott and Dumas, in popularizing remote and unfamiliar periods, but have been content to follow these models only where their successes lay within the range of association of the average reader, although here the American colonial novels are laudable as an attempt, if not as an accomplishment. As a class, however, the writers of historical fiction show a certain lack of enterprise, in which respect, at least, they compare unfavorably with the analytical novelists, or even the amateurs of local color.

On the other side, we should hear Mr. A. T. Quiller-Couch, who writes in a recent Monday *causerie*.

> "A novelist, like any other artist, has to start by taking certain things for granted; and by hoisting (so to speak) a placard at the back of the stage—'England, Seventeenth Century,' or 'France, Reign of Terror'—he gets on terms with his audience at once, sparing himself a vast labor of invention and sparing them much preliminary boredom."

This may be admitted, and yet the practice of hoisting the placard pretentiously behind very ordinary melodrama be reprehended. Assuredly, the novelist must in the main count upon the associations already existing in his reader's mind; to a few only is it given to create associations; but that teller of fairy tales who merely rung the changes upon the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

traditional "Once upon a time" would find small favor among intelligent children.

WHY DO MEN WRITE BOOKS?

The mysterious working of the impulse to literary production has again been discussed in connection with the recent death of the most learned man in England, and perhaps in all Europe. Lord Acton was apparently a born author. The acquisitive hunger was strong upon him from youth. To the end of his life he worked at least eight hours a day, so that his minute and accurate yet wide-ranging knowledge was the astonishment of those who knew its vast stores. But he published almost nothing. The one man who could best have written, for example, a history of the Middle Ages, left behind him only a huge library of annotated books, and heaps upon heaps of careful notes, to show what he might have done. The stimulus to produce was somehow wanting.

In discussing the case, the *Spectator* thinks that Lord Acton may be regarded as an example of the "reticence of learning." Yet all learning is not reticent. Let a man add to his learning a strong hortatory or reforming instinct, and he is the very one to set the world right in forty volumes. The Duke of Argyll was of this type. His page was as voluminous as Sheridan said privately that he had characterized Gibbon's—though he was understood in his speech to say "luminous." Gladstone was another whom a sort of combative passion drove to profuse writing. He could not sit in calm indifference in the presence of "the feverish volubility of ignorance." Bagehot long ago described the irresistible way in which Gladstone would be driven by the expression of perverse or mistaken opinion to try to correct it on the spot. "Let me get at the crooked reasoner, and I can persuade him of the truth." That motive agitating a learned breast will cleanse it of no end of printed perilous stuff. Lord Acton was not a meagre producer simply on account of the weight of much learning. Too nice and exhaustive scholarship may, indeed, lay a kind of paralysis upon the productive faculties; yet this comes about not through modesty, or a superior Olympian indifference to vulgar error, but through a haunting dread of not having reached the ultimate filament of truth in any given investigation. Like Mr. Brooke in 'Middlemarch,' the scholar must "pull up" somewhere in his collection of material if he is ever going to become a writer.

We are forced to fall back, we imagine, upon some hidden and unaccountable spring of activity in the writer of books, when we ask why he, rather than another, actually wrote them. It is not learning; it is not money or the lack of it, fame or the hope of it or contempt for it; it is not inheritance or opportunity, which tells the whole story. Heaven knows that it is not a conscious ability to instruct or amuse which lies behind the making of many books. Take two men of equal education, similar social status, kindred tastes, equivalent talents—what fate is it that makes one a victim of the writer's madness, and allows the other to go scot free? We cannot tell. It seems to be one of the ultimate mysteries. The pen scratches, or the typewriter clicks, where it listeth. The man who writes can give no real explanation except that he sings as do the linnets; while the Miltons who remain mute and inglorious can only say that the numbers did *not* come.

It is agreed, of course, in this age of special privileges to none, that one man is as antecedently likely as another to produce books. One good novel, it is common to say, lies in every human experience. Nay, if what Gray wrote to Walpole is true, "any fool may write a most valuable book by chance, if he will only tell us what he heard and saw with veracity." This being so, what is the magic touch, the slight disturbance of brain-stuff, which makes one fool write and another stay his pen? Pecuniary motives are much invoked in current explanations of the mystery. Yet the part which money plays in the production of literature is too uncertain and contradictory to make us attach much literary value to the jingling of the guinea. The possession of an independent fortune may appear to stimulate, or may seem to stifle, literary productiveness, and you can never tell which it will do. The "spur of poverty" may incite to a Pegasus flight, or may drive the hard-ridden hack to bolting the literary road altogether. Even the dignity and propriety of the pecuniary motive are in dispute. Hawthorne said he would never have written a page except for pay. Motley thought that it was all up with a writer when he began to consider the money he was to receive. But Hawthorne needed the money to live on, while Motley had a father and uncle to back him in his literary labors.

It will have been seen that we have no wisdom to bring to the solution of the puzzle why men write books. We have, however, two practical suggestions to offer. One of them is that any man who feels the stirring of the *cacoethes scribendi* in his bosom ought to study it conscientiously, to decide whether the prompting comes from a good or evil dæmon. He can see that many others have mistakenly thought they were called to be writers; why should he add to the number of books which might better never have been born? We think it time that the reticence of ignorance were urged as a duty, as well as the reticence of learning praised. Then we should also heartily approve the plan recently proposed of paying authors for the poor books they might have written, but refrained from producing. If Mr. Carnegie would see to financing this method of rewarding literary merit, he would have to provide, we are sure, less library room for books which arouse no question so urgent as that why on earth they were ever written.

THE APPRAISAL OF LITERATURE.

Although we have not placed the above title within quotation-marks, the phrase is one which connotes, or ought to connote, the name of Mr. George Iles. It is true that Mr. S. S. Green and others have sought, by various means, to prevent a well-intentioned public from seeking its information and ideas in worthless or trifling books; but of systematic "appraisal" on a large scale Mr. Iles is the great apostle. With words of conviction which have been accompanied by a notable generosity of purse, he has proclaimed for years the need of furnishing counsel with books, of assisting the reader by a note, of placing the expert at the elbow of the beginner. To the days when he was more or less a *vox clamantis* we need not now revert. At present he finds his warmest support within the ranks of the libraries themselves; he can point to several short bibliographies that have been brought out in pursuance of his views; and, through the recently published 'Literature of American History,' he can illustrate more fully than at any previous date the main articles of his belief.

The appearance of this work, to which an eminent editor and forty qualified contributors have set their hands, furnishes a reasonable ground for the discussion of Mr. Iles's project to annotate the literary output of the modern world. The subject can be approached in the most practical way by a reference to the spread of public libraries. Were it not for the existence of so many well-endowed institutions which have for their object the free and universal diffusion of literature, we doubt whether the appraisal scheme would as yet have passed beyond the academic stage. No men in the world are more impressed with a sense of their duty towards the public than the librarians. It is the whole aim of their profession to help the reader. The doors of the library are thrown open wide. Books are loaned to applicants from a distance as well as to residents of the town. A vast amount of thought and care is lavished upon the ever-recurring problem of liberality versus security. Thus, from morning to the mid-watches of the night, a good librarian is constantly excogitating devices for making his collection serviceable to all mankind.

Into the stack pours a hodge-podge of books to be used by the masses for their amusement, as in the case of fiction, or for their enlightenment in the different branches of knowledge. The catalogue introduces some order, but its function stops short with advertisement and classification. To be sure, the reading-room officials may put an ignoramus in the way of learning the elements of bibliography, but their time is so taxed that they can do little for each individual. Knowing how mixed his books are in point of quality, and how much the efficiency of the whole de-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pends upon the circulation of the best, the conscientious librarian is afflicted with deep searchings of heart. It is not a question of censorship or even of advice; but merely one of information. Good, bad, and indifferent stand side by side with their various allurements of title, print, binding, and illustration. Then in comes the "general reader" upon whom all this cost of fabric, endowment, and administration is lavished. He looks around at the shelves or into the catalogue, and possibly he asks a question at the desk; but when he makes his choice of the three caskets, the chances are considerably against him.

So much for the main consideration which gives the appraisal scheme its popularity. Yet here, as everywhere, there are objections. In the first place, a mining engineer does not give his report for nothing—and the value of an edition is often greater than that of a mine. In the second place, criticism varies just as much in its quality as bookmaking does. Into the matter of expense we shall not enter, for that is not the essential question. If Mr. Iles's propaganda succeeds in moulding the best opinion, money will pour forth for this, as for every other, branch of library development. We approach the crux of the situation when we ask, "Is it practicable to secure such judgments of books as will really be useful to large masses of readers?" Unless large masses are aided, the scheme must fall to the ground, because otherwise the game would not be worth the candle.

In our opinion the business of appraisal deserves to be organized and put on a permanent basis, if only two conditions are observed. Annotation should be restricted to certain classes of books, and the very best critics should be enlisted. As to the first of these conditions, it may be pointed out that 'Herod' and 'Virginibus Puerisque' and 'Kim' cannot have a value placed upon them in ten or twenty lines even if we admit that such productions can be given their due rank by immediate contemporaries. There would seem, indeed, to be a pretty clear distinction between imaginative literature and the literature which deals with what is matter of knowledge. In the case of poetry, fiction, and the highest class of essays less, certainly, can be done by the brief directive note than in cases where the subject falls within the realm of science. Mr. James Douglas, for example, might be justified in speaking dogmatically about a book on the metallurgy of copper, whereas no literary critic could speak with the same degree of confidence concerning the latest batch of sonnets. It might be found possible to convey information which would prove important to the tyro in pure literature through a semi-bibliographical or historical note, but to pass summary judgment on novels and poems is quite another thing. Where one is reading for amusement or the gratification of his æsthetic sense, he will follow his own taste and can hardly be brought up on the sheltered plan. Moreover, a vast body of technical literature, which the beginner could not understand or use, would lie outside the range of appraisal.

But, after we have restricted the field by limiting the definition, enough remains to satisfy even a strong believer in the theory of evaluation. There are still popular science, geography, many branches of history, and, in general, all those classes of books which are likely to exert a wide influence by supplying the facts whereon private judgment will eventually rest. We believe that a distinct service might be rendered to a large number of readers if the best specialists could be induced to look with favor upon Mr. Iles's scheme and to lend their aid. Brief though it must be, the purpose of a directive note is at least two-fold. The critic should give information about the book, indicating its scope, the nature of its contents, and the relative importance of its different parts. He should also set up some standard of comparison by which its merits or shortcomings may be made known. Of course, he should be strictly impersonal, and shun with the most scrupulous sense of honor this opportunity for enforcing his own views, unless he knows that, where there is room for reasonable difference of opinion, the opposite view will be given due representation. Over many such details difficulties will arise, and the best type of note can be evolved only after some experiment. At the same time these obstacles would not be insuperable if by financial inducement or an appeal to public spirit the students and critics of highest standing could be made the sole contributors.

One great point of advantage which such an annotated bibliography would have over Allibone springs from its unity of conception. Each note would be part of a well-modelled whole, and each would be complete in itself rather than a fragment wrested from a long article. We all know how useful are bibliographies like 'Best Books' and 'The Reader's Guide.' Following the appraisal idea, works of a much more elaborate and satisfactory character than these would soon be produced—to the great convenience of many in every town where a public library exists. The judgments pronounced would carry immense weight if they came from the highest recognized authorities and bore the sanction of the American Library Association. On this account they should be free from pure dogmatism and penned with a grave sense of responsibility. Otherwise, a source of authority might be created that would do more harm than good.

The 'Literature of American History,' of which Mr. J. N. Larned is editor, represents the most complete expression up to the present of Mr. Iles's ideal. Although rather too many of the notes are drawn from reviews which have been written with another purpose, the work has true unity of design, and although some *obiter dicta* may be discovered, they do not form a serious blemish. But we must defer closer criticism. It is the fate of this book to be rapidly read out of its covers in the large libraries—an honorable distinction which it well deserves. More important still, it is not unlikely to help forward Mr. Iles's plans for a wider appraisal of literature, by the force of a successful example.

A FRENCHMAN'S DIARY IN OUR CIVIL-WAR TIME.—III.

January 7, 1865.—From New York to Washington, being ferried across the Susquehanna, full of floating ice. Called on Charles Sumner; went up to the Capitol. Sumner took me to the White House to call on Lincoln, saying, "You will see Saint Louis under the oak of Vincennes." We entered a large room, very simply furnished, in which a dozen persons were seated awaiting their turn. On the walls, maps were hung over the fireplace, and a portrait of President Jackson, whose hard and shrunken face bore the imprint of great energy; on the mantelpiece was a photograph of John Bright. Through two great windows I saw a white streak of the Potomac, the Virginia heights, the unfinished Washington obelisk. Between the windows was a desk, at which the President was seated. He did not heed our entering, being absorbed in a communication which some one was making to him. After this visitor came a woman, asking that her husband, a soldier in the regular army, be allowed to return to her. "Let me help you," said Lincoln; and he questioned her with the method and clearness of a lawyer. Against the white light of the window his angular profile stood out in shadow; his hand, frequently passed through his hair, raised it in disorderly tufts. While he spoke, all the muscles of his face were in motion; his voice had an almost paternal gentleness. "I cannot," he said finally, "grant your request," adding with a strange laugh, "I can disband all the Union armies, but I cannot send a single soldier home. Only the colonel of his regiment can do that for your husband." The woman complained of her poverty: "Never have I suffered so much." "Madam," replied Lincoln, changing the tone of his voice and with a measured solemnity, "I sympathize in your disappointment; but consider that all of us, in every part of the country, are to-day suffering what we have never suffered." He then bent towards her, wrote some words on a paper, handed it to the entreating woman, and dismissed her.

Next in turn came a young man who, approaching the President, but without sitting down, said to him: "I have only come to shake hands with Abraham Lincoln." "Much obliged, sir," said Lincoln, stretching out his large hand.

Perceiving Mr. Sumner, he beckons to him, and I am presented. Lincoln extends his hand, and after a brief exchange of courtesies our visit comes to an end.

We then directed our steps to Mr. Seward. The Secretary of State is much more inaccessible than the President. His photographs had not conveyed to me an exact idea of this subtle face, these small, inquisitive eyes, hid beneath gray brows, which seem ever to be searching out the inmost thought of his interlocutor. He read deliberately the two letters from the Comte de Paris and the Prince de Joinville which I brought him, and conversation began rather laboriously. Sumner turned it on the letters published in the London *Times* by "Historicus" (Vernon Harcourt), touching delicate points of international law. "It is sometimes a good thing," said Seward, "not to know too much of it. We have a solid enough base when we stick to general principles. I am not much afraid of precedents; England furnishes us a rich mine in comparison with what she can find over here."

January 8.—Religious service by Dr. Channing, nephew of the celebrated Channing, whose congregation meets at the Capitol in the Representatives' chamber. After the singing of hymns, Dr. Channing delivers a sermon in which he contrives to introduce

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Laboulaye, Gasparin, Guizot, Goldwin Smith, John Bright, Sumner, Garrison, and George Thompson. In the course of the day I called with Sumner on the foreign Ministers.

In the evening at Mr. Seward's, who was in a very genial mood and conversed freely. He told me that in 1833 he went to see Lafayette at La Grange. The latter, who had just fallen out with Louis Philippe, predicted that the new dynasty would survive only eighteen years. "Would he were there to-day," said I, "to make as accurate predictions!" "You have," answered Seward, "a revolutionary cycle in France. When, in England, I saw Queen Victoria and her children, the idea never occurred to me that anything could disturb the future of that family and the order of succession [this was uttered with a smile intended for Mr. Rose, the Canadian delegate, then in Washington]. At Compiègne, when the Empress presented her young son to me, I kissed him on the forehead, thinking that if his father should die, his only portion would be exile." "It is not my judgment," he continued, "that the Emperor is hostile to us. It seems to me that I could bring him over." And again: "In France you appear to me to have four parties—Legitimists, Orleanists, Republicans, and Bonapartists. Under each government the beaten parties coalesce against the more fortunate rival."

January 9.—Visited the Supreme Court, Chase Chief Justice with seven associates. In the Senate, while chatting with Sumner on a sofa, Senator Powell, ex-Governor of Kentucky, came up and said to Sumner: "When will you accept delivery of the twenty-five niggers I've been offering you for three years? I will pay their travelling expenses. Your bill [the bill under discussion emancipated the wives and children of blacks enrolled in the army] is going to make more unfortunates—as if you had not made enough already. You are a handful of fanatics engaged in destroying the country. It is very nice of you still to talk about the Constitution; why not frankly trample it under foot?" He went on for a long time in this strain, with frequent interruptions of his wrath to eject a yellow saliva on the carpet. Sumner listened to him without a word. When Powell had retired, "That," he said, "is what I have had to bear for years. From the manner in which they treat us when in power, you may guess what it used to be."

Evening reception at the White House. Mr. and Mrs. Lincoln, Sumner, Seward.

January 10.—Soirée at Senator Harris's (of New York). Trumbull, Sprague.

January 11.—In the evening, called with my wife on Mrs. Lincoln. Her language now and again betrayed her humble origin, but she said nothing indiscreet or out of place. There was some very critical talk of General Butler, but she was very diplomatic. She spoke becomingly of an old female friend now a flaming secessionist. Of the soldiers she spoke, quite unconsciously, as a Princess might have done: "In our public ceremonies, what I always like to see best is our dear blue-coats."

January 12.—Drove to Arlington with Mrs. Hooker and Miss Motley, crossing the Potomac at Georgetown. On the Virginia side there is a pretty steep ascent of the heights on which the Army of the Potomac was so long encamped. The ground we traversed formerly belonged to Mrs. Washington; before the war, to Gen. Lee. Lee's house is small and dilapidated. It commands an admirable view. From the portico, Washington determined the plan of the Capitol of the United States.

Visited the freedmen's village on Arlington Heights.

In the evening, dined at Seward's with Sumner and Farragut. The service was of Sèvres, presented to Seward by Prince Napoleon.

January 13.—Mrs. Lincoln drove us through the suburbs. From the Soldiers' Home the prospect is even finer than at Arlington. In the evening, with Mr. and Mrs. Lincoln and Charles Sumner, we went to the theatre direct from the White House. There was no private entrance to the proscenium boxes, and we had to pass behind the spectators in the galleries. The double box we occupied was very spacious, but so plainly furnished that they had not taken the trouble to cover with velvet or cloth the front planking, but had just tacked some red velvet on the rail. The play was "King Lear," with Forrest in the leading rôle. His part was fairly well rendered, but with too much exaggeration. The rest of the troupe was wretched. The President listened very attentively. He seemed extremely familiar with Shakspere, and in several places remarked on the changes made in performance. His boy of eleven was beside him, and the father often clasped him very tenderly, as the child leaned his head upon his shoulder; and when the little fellow, as he often did, asked for explanations, Lincoln invariably made answer, "My child, it is in the play." When the traitor was thrust through with a sword, Lincoln said: "I have only one reproach to make of Shakspere's heroes—that they make long speeches when they are killed."

THE EXCAVATION OF CORINTH.

OFF THE COAST OF DALMATIA,
June 25, 1902.

It is from no mere desire to exploit an enterprise in which I happen to be interested, but from a sense of duty towards the American public, that I have from time to time given in the columns of the *Nation* information concerning the progress of the excavations carried on at Corinth since 1896 by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens.

Last year I omitted my usual letter, because our results were not important. In fact, in my report of that year to the Managing Committee of the School, I frankly admitted that we had for the first time suffered a defeat. While holding to the principle that a war is not lost by the failure of a single campaign, I entered upon the campaign of the present year with the conviction that it would either be the last, or would show that our work would have to go on and perhaps take larger proportions than ever. The latter has proved to be the case.

It would be an overstatement to say that last year's work was an *absolute* failure. In excavations like ours, a negative result is, after all, worth something as a guide, telling us where not to dig. We happened to choose a part of the Agora which proved to be empty, and to uncover which involved the removing of an enormous quantity of earth that contained nothing of interest. But we found a considerable number of inscriptions, both Latin and Greek, of the Roman city, two statue bases inscribed with the name of Lysippus, as well as a considerable quantity of Proto-Corinthian bases, mostly in fragments. We also found part of a line of vaulted chambers on the south side of the Temple hill (similar to that found in 1898 on the east side, bordering the street leading from the Agora towards Lechæum), with remains of a stylobate of a porch thrown out in front of them, as in the east-side system. To say nothing of the fact that we cleared the Temple foundations of all the earth covering them, we got one positive result in the last three days of the campaign in the discovery of the stumps of two Doric columns resting on a stylobate. These pointed out a hopeful place for beginning work this year.

We began early in order to push matters to a conclusion, and had the longest campaign of all that we have had, from the beginning of March to June 14. The columns just mentioned proved to belong to the front line of a Greek portico running east and west back of the vaulted chambers found last year, as long as the well-known stoa of Attolos at Athens, over 100 metres long. Its breadth was so great that it was provided with an interior line of columns of the Ionic order, with intercolumniations twice as great as those of the Doric columns at the front. At its back the rock of the temple hill was cut away to make room for it. It had perhaps already been destroyed when the Roman vaulted chambers were built in front of it, inasmuch as there is an interval of only about three feet between its front and their back line. But stumps of the Doric columns remain all along the line, with here and there one lacking. Of the Ionic columns we have for the most part only the bases and capital. Enough remains of the Doric capitals and entablature to allow a restoration of the whole on paper. The architrave and triglyphon are in every case composed of a single block. The cornice blocks bear a great deal of paint on their under sides.

When we had uncovered about fifty metres of the east end of the portico, it became impracticable to carry the earth to our railroad, which had been stopped by intervening walls; and to find the dimensions of our portico we tapped the line of its front stylobate farther west, then tunnelled for a space, and then tapped again, until at last we found the end imbedded in a mass of late masonry. The uncovering will have to be completed next year by bringing the track to this west end and securing dumping privileges in this quarter. But to secure dumping privileges, "there's the rub."

As far as we did clear the portico, we also cleared back of it, following the slope of the bed rock up to the temple. We did the same back of the east line of chambers, the north end of which we excavated completely, ascertaining its extent, and found that there were eighteen chambers in all. In this part of the work we found another Greek stoa of larger dimensions than that already described on the south side of the hill, but much more broken up, only one column being found *in situ*. The Romans probably broke it up when they laid out their system in front of it and lower down. Back of the Greek stoa and much higher up the hill is the stylobate of a late Roman or Byzantine stoa, which

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

probably coexisted with the Roman chambers with their porch at the front. Porch above porch must have given this side of the Temple hill a fine aspect from Pirene and the Lechæum road. The whole area between this upper stoa and the back of the vaulted chambers was filled up to make a broad area for circulation of the populace.

Our excavation back of the Roman systems and to a much deeper level in front of the corner where they approach each other at the southeast, brought a rich reward in single finds. Old Corinthian and Proto-Corinthian pottery in abundance, measured by bushels; terracotta figurines, some of them extremely archaic, and at the same time finely wrought; several old Greek inscriptions, one of them at least as old as the sixth century, and in the local Corinthian alphabet; two hundred terracotta lamps with interesting representations and inscriptions on them, ranging from the sixth century B. C. to the fifth century A. D., most of them found in a large water conduit which ran about fifteen feet below the south-side porch—all these are far from making a complete catalogue of our finds.

But it is, after all, the parts of the ancient city now laid bare to the inspection of the modern world that constitute the real success of our undertaking. Corinth now claims attention as a place that must be visited as must Olympia and Delphi. Six years ago it seemed to many as hopeless to attempt to find Greek Corinth under the modern, the Byzantine, and the Roman Corinth, as it would be now to try to find Greek Byzantium under the modern Stambul. But we were singularly fortunate in getting upon the track of Pausanias at once. In the first campaign we found the Theatre; in the second, Pirene; in the third we found the Agora and the fountain Glauke, and gave the correct name of Temple of Apollo to the venerable ruin, the only landmark of ancient Corinth up to 1896. After that we ceased to be under heavy obligations to Pausanias, and in our work of this year we could give him points. We have been dealing with things that were already underground at the time of his visit.

Our work in the Theatre in 1896 was of value chiefly as giving us the necessary starting-point in the topography. We found the cavea in an absolutely ruinous condition, and decided to let the Theatre lie while we grappled with the more interesting region east of the Temple. But it had always troubled my conscience that we had made no serious examination of the stage building. This year we dug a trench from what appeared to be the centre of the orchestra, at right angles to the supposed line of the stage. As a result, we found so many walls all running at right angles to our trench, that we hardly knew what to make of them. When we reached virgin soil at a depth of about eight metres, our trench, which was six metres wide at the top, was narrowed down to about two metres, and we could not move to the right or left without going beyond the limits of a tentative excavation. But it now seems clear that the orchestra and stage ought to be thoroughly cleared. The walls which we found probably belong to two stage buildings, the Greek and the Roman. In our trench we found a great quantity of marble fragments, mostly architectural; other pieces seemed to belong to a large medallion containing a head of Medusa in high relief. In addition to these fragments there was found at the very bottom of the trench a marble head of a youth, which is not only the best head found at Corinth, but is a real prize, and would be an ornament to any museum. Close beside it was a piece of marble inscribed thus:

Σ ΑΘΗΝΑΙΟΣ ΕΠΟΙΗΣΕ

It is unfortunate that of the artist's name only the last letter, and that a sigma, survives.

It will be seen, then, that our future work is prescribed for us in two places. It would be a thousand pities to turn over work of this kind at this stage to another nation. There is no question that somebody will do it. Although I have not been able to make a large plan and carry it out as I could have done had I had a large fund put at my disposal at the outset, yet I have no more right to complain of my support than of the results. Men were thanked in ancient Rome "because they had not despaired of the Republic." I should like to thank the good men and women in America who have not despaired of this enterprise. At the head of the list I should put the name of the Hon. John Hay, who, in 1898, when we were in a tight place, grappling with Pirene, sent us £100 from London, not his first contribution, with the remark, "I am glad to be interested in your work to that extent." The late Benjamin T. Frothingham, Esq., of Brooklyn, who from the beginning sent in his contribution unsolicited, sent it this year when we were already in the field, with the remark, "I hope my contribution is not too late." I do not mention these as the largest contributors—they are not—but as showing the spirit in which the work is supported. It would hardly be befitting to parade here the names of the donors, which are given in the official reports of the School. Without trenching upon such a list I may add that Gen. William J. Palmer of Colorado Springs, on leaving Greece five days ago, put into my hands fifty pounds (not his first gift), as a nest-egg for next year. No question is more frequently asked me by foreigners visiting the excavations than: "What funds does your Government give you?" I reply, "That is not the American way. I depend on American men, and so far they have not failed me."

A whole generation of young men engaged in this work have by it become archæologists. It stirs interest to handle material which you take out of the ground yourself. As for myself, if I should live to be an octogenarian, I never expect to associate myself with so honorable an enterprise. RUFUS B. RICHARDSON.

THE CHOISEULS.—II.

PARIS, July 18, 1902.

A short time after the death of Madame de Pompadour occurred an event of great importance—the expulsion of the Jesuits from France. Choiseul has been accused of having taken the initiative in this matter; not quite accurately, as he took sides against the celebrated society only after the Parlement had engaged in hostilities. That body ordered the Jesuits to present their *constitutions* for examination, and afterwards issued several judgments against them; finally, the Order was suppressed. The Jesuits had been expelled from Russia in 1719; in Portugal, in 1758, Pombal had taken Draconian measures against them, after an attempt which had been made on the life of the King of Portugal; in 1764 they had been turned out of Spain by Charles III. The powerful Company has survived all the attempts made against it. It has been said of its members, "They go out by the door, and return by the window." This persistence should be a lesson to those who resort to violent measures against any spiritual force.

The Society of Jesus had powerful friends at court, the Queen and the Dauphin in particular, and Choiseul became the object of their enmity. The place of a favorite was vacant, and Choiseul's adversaries tried to give it to a friend of the Jesuits, the Countess d'Esparbès. She was already on the point of being recognized (what was called *déclarée*), when Choiseul intervened, threatening to leave his post of Prime Minister. He accompanied a letter to the King, in which he complained of all the intrigues of his enemies, with a long memoir, in which he recalled, not without some pride, all the acts of his ministry; he set forth the state of all the departments at the time when he was put at their head, and explained the situation in which he left them. After having read this memoir, the King sent for Choiseul and asked him to remain in power. Choiseul consented, without having many illusions as to the future. "Your Majesty," he said, "will have it so. I remain; but a time will come when, after all these marks of kindness, your Majesty will send me into exile." These words were prophetical. The same day Madame d'Esparbès received a *lettre de cachet*, which exiled her to Montauban, near her father, the Marquis de Lussan. The Jesuits had some hope that the Dauphin would obtain their recall; but he fell ill at Compiègne after some manœuvres, and died soon afterwards. His wife was not long in following him, and Choiseul's enemies did not hesitate to spread calumnious reports about these successive deaths; the word poison was pronounced, but it is absolutely certain that both the Dauphin and his wife died from natural causes.

It was in the year 1765 that Madame de Choiseul met Horace Walpole at the house of Madame du Deffand. All the readers of Walpole's charming letters know the pages in which are found portraits of those two ladies. Walpole was immediately drawn to Madame de Choiseul, but his sympathy, which was rather cold at first, became by degrees a real admiration, even a sort of enthusiasm. He was not so much charmed with the Duke, and found him rather too volatile. Towards the sister of the Duke, Madame de Gramont, he felt sentiments almost of hatred, and did not hesitate to give credence to the rumors which were current as to the nature of the relation of the brother and sister. In the curious collection of the drawings by Carmontelle of which I spoke lately, and which are preserved in the château of Chantilly, there is a very interesting one representing Madame du Deffand with Madame de Choiseul; they are beside each other in the chamber of the Convent of St. Joseph where Madame du Deffand lived. She is sitting, as usual,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the sort of chair which was called a *tonneau;* the Duchess is standing and is offering her a doll, as is suitable for a "grandmother" visiting her "granddaughter." This drawing was sent to Walpole (Carmontelle generally made copies of his drawings), who was delighted; he found fault only with the likeness of Madame de Choiseul, but Madame du Deffand's likeness was pronounced perfect.

The Duchess de Choiseul spent some months every year at Chanteloup, a place she had bought and where she found rest after the agitation of court life. We have some letters which she wrote from Chanteloup to her friend Madame du Deffand. In one of them (dated July 17, 1766) she gives her opinion of J. J. Rousseau, who was filling the world at the time with the noise of his quarrel with Voltaire. She speaks of Rousseau as

"a man always subjugated by his vanity, who has made himself singular in order to become famous, who has always denied himself the pleasure of gratitude in order to avoid the slightest obligation; who has preached to all nations, screaming to them, 'Hear, I am the oracle of truth; my odd manners are only the mark of my simplicity; I am the fabricator of virtue, the essence of justice.' . . . I have always distrusted this Rousseau, with his singular systems, his extraordinary accoutrement, and his pulpit eloquence transported to the housetops. He has always appeared to me a charlatan of virtue."

Some parts of this long letter, bearing on politics and on the foundation of good government, are curious enough if you remember that J. J. Rousseau afterwards became a demigod to the Terrorists of the French Revolution. Madame de Choiseul shows herself fully in one passage in this interesting letter. After her condemnation of J. J. Rousseau, she alludes to other hypocrites who affect timidity and modesty:

"I believe no more in these than in the first. Real virtue is more simple. She is unostentatious because she believes that she has not to be proud of anything; she conceals nothing because she does not think herself to be in view, and does not expect any praise. She is neither vain nor modest because she is simple, and she is simple because she is true."

Madame de Choiseul's letters to her friend are admirable for their good sense and their reason. "Do you know why you are so *ennuyée?*" she inquires of Madame du Deffand, who was perpetually complaining of being bored; "it is precisely because of the pains which you take to prevent, to foresee, to combat this ennui. Live from day to day; take time as it comes."

There was so much wisdom in Madame de Choiseul that Madame du Deffand, old as she was, used to call her her "grandmamma," and Madame de Choiseul in turn called Madame du Deffand "my grandchild." Madame de Choiseul spoke her mind very freely to her friend. She once became incensed with Voltaire, who had dared to write these lines to Madame du Deffand on the subject of the Empress Catharine:

" I am her knight against everybody. I know very well that people reproach her for some bagatelles in the matter of her husband, but these are family affairs, which do not concern me; and then it is not bad that there should be a fault to repair."

The Duchess did not appreciate these ironical remarks of the philosopher:

"What!" says she; "Voltaire finds a subject of pleasantry in an assassination? And what an assassination! the murder of a sovereign by his subject, of a husband by his wife! This woman conspires against her husband and her sovereign; she takes from him his life and his empire in the most cruel manner; she becomes an usurper against her own son, and this is what Voltaire calls family quarrels."

Madame du Deffand had herself answered Voltaire in a less serious way:

"Never, sir, resist the temptation to write to me; you cannot imagine what good your letters do me. The last one especially had an admirable effect; it rid me of the spleen of which I was a victim. There is no *humeur noire* which could not be combated by the eulogy you make of your northern 'Semiramis.' Those bagatelles which people repeat regarding her husband, and with which you will not concern yourself, since they are family affairs, would make even the dead laugh."

It must be confessed that Madame du Deffand has here the advantage of her "grandmamma." The Duchess, though she could be very angry with Voltaire, admired him greatly, and rendered him many services while he remained at Ferney.

After the death of Madame de Pompadour, the surroundings of Louis XV. remained for several years what they were before; Madame de Choiseul, Madame de Gramont, Madame de Beauvau, Madame de Mirepoix continued to be assiduous at the King's suppers and journeys; but things changed when he distinguished Madame du Barry and felt a senile passion for her. The extraction of the new favorite, the depravation of her early youth, her vulgarity, her ignorance, produced a revolt at court. Choiseul could not but espouse the cause of his wife, who refused to associate with Madame du Barry. He tried with all his might to prevent her formal presentation. Madame du Barry triumphed over his resistance, and was presented on the 27th of April, 1769. From that day, it could be prophesied that Choiseul's power was coming to an end. The relations of the Minister and the favorite were courteous, and Louis XV. amused himself by bringing them together as often as he could. But, with all his levity, Choiseul could not be subservient to her; he was helped by his pride. He was for a moment afraid that the King would marry his young favorite (Maria Leczinska had died on June 24, 1768); the King promised him not to do so, in a curious letter in which he said: "You manage my affairs well; I am satisfied with you. . . . You know Madame du Barry; she is pretty; I am satisfied with her. . . Very certainly, you will not see me taking a *dame de Maintenon.* I need not ask you to consider this private."

Madame du Barry and the Chancellor Maupeou began open war against Choiseul, with the help of the Duke d'Aiguillon. They had on their side the friends of the Jesuits, the devout party; Choiseul had with him the Parlement, but he was defeated, and Louis XV. finally signed the *lettre de cachet* which exiled Choiseul to Chanteloup, his country place.

Notes.

Dodd, Mead & Co. have in press the authorized 'Biography of Bret Harte,' by T. Edgar Pemberton; 'The Uganda Protectorate,' by Sir Harry Johnston; 'A History of the Nineteenth Century, Year by Year,' by Edwin Emerson, jr.; and 'The Weather, and Practical Methods of Forecasting,' by E. B. Dunn.

The Century Co. will bring out in the autumn 'The Story of Athens,' by Howard Crosby Butler, lecturer on architecture at Princeton University, some of whose drawings will be joined with the abundant photographic illustrations.

As products of the printer's art, the three handy volumes of the Lewis and Clark Journals forming part of the New Amsterdam Book Co.'s "Commonwealth Library" are to be commended without reserve. The type employed is small but distinct, and the general appearance is tasteful. We should criticise it as a too slavish reprint of Biddle's 1814 recension of the original diaries in that it does not even contain the name of Biddle, so that the Paul Allen who signs the preface and seems to identify himself with the editor (whereas he only saw the work through the press) will impose on present-day readers. Moreover, the opportunity to supply an index and modern maps has been put by, so that the publishers exhibit the minimum of enterprise.

Since we last took notice of the commendable Temple edition (Dent-Lippincott) of the Bible, the little volumes have been multiplying apace—four for the Old and six for the New Testament. The scheme is well maintained of a popular critical introduction and of appendices synchronizing the history of the period for several ancient countries, and indexing the pertinent Biblical references in English literature; better still, the text is rationally paragraphed and the poetry printed as poetry. The limp olive-green covers are an invitation to the companionship of the pocket.

It smacks somewhat of anachronism to have, twenty-nine years after its original publication, the well-known and much-read work of Georg Brandes, 'The Romantic School in Germany,' being the second volume of his "Main Currents in Nineteenth-Century Literature," appear in an American edition (Macmillan); and it is hardly worth while at this late date to enter once more upon its grave defects and its unquestionable merits. Its arbitrary combinations, its rough-and-ready judgments, its lack of sympathy with the deepest aspirations and the finest ideals of German Romanticism, are a matter of public record. One only needs to compare it with Ricarda Hach's 'Blütezeit der Romantik' (Leipzig: 1899) to see at a glance how antiquated from the literary point of view this book is, how much closer to the heart of the Romantic movement we have come since its first appearance, how much more Romantic we have ourselves become. One sentence of the introduction, "Regarded as a whole, German Romanticism is reaction," should be enough to show that Brandes's book cannot be classed with the standard works of objective history. If it nevertheless has a vitality of its own, if in a way it is a classic production, it derives this distinction from the bold subjectivity of its author, from his fearless courage in speaking his mind, in asserting his principles at all hazards, in turning even a literary study into a political pamphlet. As a brilliant manifesto of the political and religious liberalism of the middle of the nineteenth century, this book will always retain its value.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In politico-statistical handbooks our Canadian neighbors are much in advance of ourselves. There is nothing to compare, on our side of the line, with 'Morang's Annual Register of Canadian Affairs,' just launched at Toronto by George N. Morang & Co., under the direction of J. Castell Hopkins. It is a stout volume of 540 pages, of which the last thirty are occupied by an index of names and another of "events and affairs." At the beginning is a conspectus of the Governments of the Empire in 1901 (such as are represented in the present London conference of the premiers), followed by the personnel of the Governments of Canadian Provinces, of Senate and House of Commons of the Dominion, and a list of daily newspapers. The Register fairly opens with sections on Canadian Agriculture, Mineral Development, Forests and Fisheries, Manufacturing Industries, Trade and Commerce, Finances; to which succeeds the historical chronicle of Canada and the Crown (from the Queen's death to the King's birthday), the Royal Tour of Canada, Canada and the War. Next in order (or shall we say, out of order?) come Education in Canada, Transportation Interests, Population and Immigration, Government and Politics; The Canadian Militia, Financial Interests, and, finally, Canadian Obituary for 1901. Under Government and Politics, each province is considered in turn with more or less particular report of parliamentary debates. The utility of this compilation is apparent, and time will no doubt bring improvement in it.

One of the chief obstacles in the way of the student of philosophy arises from the unsettled state of the frontiers of the subject, and the consequent difficulty of grasping its proper standpoint and its exact relations to adjacent subjects. Hence teachers of philosophy will probably welcome the late Prof. Henry Sidgwick's 'Philosophy: Its Scope and its Relations' (Macmillan), which treats of these topics in the form of a course of introductory lectures (dating from 1892). In spite, however, of an abundance of shrewd remarks and of a characteristically scrupulous and dispassionate method of discussion, the first impression of the result is somewhat disappointing, and a cursory reader may even be led to think that the subject is finally left very much where it was taken up. For Professor Sidgwick certainly never seems to reach a formal and clear-cut classification of the philosophic sciences such as is needed to remove the existing confusion, inconvenience, and ambiguity. Still, a lucid discussion of such difficult problems by the mature powers of one of the finest critical intellects of our time is bound to be instructive and stimulating to philosophers of every school, and in this sense Professor Sidgwick may be said to have succeeded. Beyond that his common-sense method of looking for formulas to which all parties might subscribe, could hardly be expected to carry him, for, as matters stand, the divergences in conception, aim, method, and terminology of the various philosophic sects seem to be irreducible. A wholly satisfactory solution, therefore, would require either the promulgation of a systematic scheme of such manifest utility as to lead to its general adoption, or the deliberate acceptance of a common terminology by all parties. Neither of these alternatives seems immediately probable, but to either Professor Sidgwick's work ought to smooth the way.

'Otto Hübner's Geographisch-statistische Tabellen aller Länder der Erde' (Frankfort: H. Keller; New York: Lemcke & Buechner) enters on its second half-century of usefulness with the annual issue for 1902, under the editorship of Prof. Dr. Fr. von Juraschek. The table of sources alone for this compilation is worth a large share of the price of the thin volume. In the first section each country of the world is tabulated, with the name of its chief ruler, its area, numerical population, racial composition, religion, budget, army, navy, merchant marine, etc.; and these details are supplemented in the second section with railroad, telegraph, coinage, measures, products, capital and chief-town statistics; while the remaining tables offer convenient economic comparisons between the leading civilized nations, and show the world's gold and silver output for two decades, its exports and imports, etc.

We have received from the publisher, Armand Colin, the *Annales* of seven of the eight sections of the International Congress of Comparative History held in Paris in 1900 (that of Music being unreported). The first volume (General History and Diplomatics) contains the names of the committee of organization, and of members, in addition to the several papers which make up each volume. Comparative History of Institutions and Law; of Social Economy; of Religious Affairs; of the Sciences; of Literatures; of the Arts of Design, furnishes the material for the succeeding volumes —the fourth (on Religion) being notably the thinnest. On some of these we may touch in detail hereafter. The letterpress is beautifully clear and open, and there are occasional illustrations.

The central piece in the current (38th) number of the Year-book of the German Shakespeare Society is a reprint of the first (the Italianate) version of Ben Jonson's "Every Man in his Humour," which has thus far strangely escaped the zeal of the modern editor of reprints. Thus once again does this excellent annual vindicate its indispensable value to the student of Shakspere and the Elizabethan drama. Other noteworthy contents are the address on the question of the origin and early versions of "Hamlet," by Professor Schick, a reprint of the closing scenes of Thomas Heywood's "If you know not me, you know nobody," various documents dating from 1602 and the following years relating to the visits of English actors to the court of Duke Philip Julius of Pommern-Wolgast, and many shorter notices and book-reviews in its field, together with the customary extensive annual Shakspere Bibliography.

The house of E. A. Seemann, Leipzig (New York: Lemcke & Buechner), has begun a serial publication of colored reproductions of 100 contemporary German painters ('Hundert Meister der Gegenwart'), of which the first number is to hand. It contains five examples—a head of Bismarck by Franz von Lenbach; a study of a female head by F. A. von Kaulbach; Falstaff, by Eduard Grützner; a newspaper reader, by Wilhelm Leibl; and two Dutch girls on the dunes, by Hans von Bartels. The accompanying text is from the pen of Fritz von Ostini, but other writers will share in the description of the artists and their works. The publisher's aim is not to cover the field as regards artists—for the choice of a hundred must be arbitrary—but to give characteristic specimens of the art of the group determined on. It is obvious, and it appears incidentally from Ostini's letterpress, that the scale of the original may be departed from, but this is not expressly indicated, nor is the whereabouts or ownership of the original indicated. The color process is not equally successful in all the cases to which it has been applied, but it serves well enough for a memorandum and will be popularly appreciated.

The latest number of the *Archiv für Papyruskunde*, edited by Prof. Ulrich Wilcken of the Würzburg University, and published by Teubner in Leipzig, contains several articles of special interest. The first of these contributions is by the well-known papyrologist, Jules Nicole of Geneva, who describes and translates a papyrus on which are written questions and answers concerning surgical operations, showing how medical examinations were conducted in Egypt eighteen centuries ago. Unfortunately, it is only a fragment, but its contents, so far as they have been preserved, indicate a fair knowledge of anatomy and treat the subject from quite a modern point of view. The questions are such as might be properly put in a medical school of the present day. The second paper is a History of Circumcision, by the editor, with an article on Circumcision in the Old Testament, by Professor Gunckel of Berlin. Both writers agree that this rite was common to primitive tribes, especially in hot countries, and was hygienic in its original character. The Hebrews did not borrow it from the Egyptians, but it was practised by both peoples long before the sojourn of the Israelites in Egypt. A third contribution, to which we wish to call attention, is entitled "Zwei Bankanweisungen aus den Berliner Papyri," by Prof. Otto Gradenwitz of Königsberg, who shows that banks existed in Egypt and issued and accepted checks and bills of exchange two thousand years ago; and, although the form of these drafts was more complicated than at present, they amounted simply to orders to pay a certain sum to a certain person clearly specified, and to charge the same to the account of the undersigned.

We have already indicated the general contents of the unusually rich volume of Proceedings (xv. of the second series) of the Massachusetts Historical Society. Prof. Franklin B. Dexter's communication regarding the Jonathan Edwards MSS. now in the keeping of the Yale University Library possesses a more than curious interest, as either suggesting or demonstrating traits of character which serve to make Edwards a living human figure. For instance, Mr. Dexter's conviction, on examining this mass of his papers, is that "Edwards himself was, with all his genius, altogether practical and efficient in business affairs." Later on in the volume Mr. William P. Upham publishes the results of his decipherment of Edwards's shorthand, which is shown in facsimile and in carefully drawn characters, so far as the extant script supplies material. There are twenty consonant characters, four digraphs, and signs for *some*, *small*, *world*, *because*, and *perhaps*.

Mr. Joseph G. Rosengarten, Philadelphia, has reprinted from the *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* his translation of the Hessian Stephen Popp's Journal of his service in the Bayreuth-Anspach

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

regiments in our Revolution (1777-1783), to which we have already directed attention. Two of the three military pencil maps accompanying the original manuscript in the Bayreuth city library are here reproduced, together with a fourth not alluded to in the prefatory note.

The convenience of our English term "record," in the sporting sense, finds illustration in this item from *Minerva* of June 29: "L'Equador tiene il *record* dei vulcani" (Ecuador holds the record for volcanoes).

The National Central Library in Florence is rejoicing in the Chamber of Deputies' confirmation on June 27 of an agreement between the State and the municipality with regard to the long-awaited construction of a new home for this great institution—not only commodious but "worthy of the city's glorious traditions." The site chosen is on the Corso dei Tintori, fronting the Piazza dei Cavalleggeri, now occupied in part by the ex-convent of Santa Croce, of which Brunellesco's cloisters will be preserved and restored. The building is to be completed, with the books installed, not later than "December 31, 1909" (1907?), at an estimated cost of $580,000.

The assembling of nearly eight hundred of the school-teachers of the Transvaal and Orange River Colony at Johannesburg on July 2, for a ten days' conference, has great significance. In the opening address, Mr. Sargant, the Director of Education, stated that "colored children had just as much right as the children of other taxpayers to access to Government schools, and the Government recognized its duty to provide schools for them. It was impossible, however, to disregard the social usages of generations. Therefore, in spite of the extra expenditure involved, separate schools, just as well equipped, would be provided for the colored population." The instructive part of the conference consisted of a series of lectures on various subjects connected with teachers' work, technical education, mining, and voice production. The Astronomer Royal of the Cape, Sir David Gill, gave three lectures on astronomy, and Major-General Baden-Powell impressed upon the teachers the value of the cultivation of habits of observation. The citizens of Johannesburg subscribed a large sum to defray the cost of the conference, besides opening their homes to the visitors. Among the entertainments provided were theatrical performances, musical soirées, visits to the mines, and excursions in the neighborhood.

The broadening influences at work respecting the common-school or secondary education in England are indicated by the fact that the Government has provided sixteen holiday courses for the study of modern languages by teachers and others. Seven of these are to be held in different places in France, including Paris and Tours, four in Germany, three in Switzerland, and two in Avila and Santander in Spain.

A reader has done us the kindness to expose a sad lapse of the pen by which Professor Forsyth's 'Theory of Differential Equations' was ascribed in our last issue (in the brief note at p. 71) to Professor "Thorpe."

—The *National Geographic Magazine* for July contains the preliminary report, by Mr. Robert T. Hill of the Geological Survey, of his personal investigations of the Martinique disaster. A sketch of the geologic and volcanic history of the Caribbees introduces a detailed account of the actual events of the great eruption from the statements of eyewitnesses. It is made apparent that the warnings were numerous and continuous for at least two weeks before May 8. Mrs. Prentiss, wife of the American Consul, wrote that on April 23 "she heard three distinct shocks or reports in St. Pierre, which were so great that the dishes were thrown from the shelves and the house rocked." A few days before her death she records this significant fact: "The smell of sulphur is so strong that horses on the street stop and snort, and some of them drop in their harness and die from suffocation." The devastation was confined to a comparatively small district, and the changes are "merely the superficial destruction of vegetation and the veneering of a small triangular area with a thin layer of ashes and mud. . . . Nineteen-twentieths of the area of Martinique is as green and beautiful to-day as it ever was." As a result of his observations, Mr. Hill concludes that the eruptions were repetitions of old phenomena, and their cause "was not the development of a local fissure suddenly letting the water of the sea down to the depths of the hot magma, but, upon the contrary, resulted from a widely occurring disturbance within the interior of the earth's magma, which caused it to rise to meet the upper wet zone, rather than the water of the latter to descend to it, and which is as yet inexplicable." In his somewhat optimistic account of the political and economic conditions of Martinique, he contrasts the prosperity and happiness of the people under local self-government with the English West Indies, which are "blighted and dying from the colonial system of government." Prof. I. C. Russell of the University of Michigan gives the results of his observation of the eruptions on the island of St. Vincent. At one place a narrow river-valley had been filled "to a depth of fifty or sixty feet with freshly fallen débris. Through this material, surface water was working its way, and, meeting the still hot stones and dirt, was being changed to steam, which, escaping from thousands of vents, formed white columns that rose at times hundreds of feet into the air." The specimens of the products of the eruptions collected by Messrs. Hill and Russell are described, geologically by J. S. Diller, chemically by W. F. Hillebrand. There are several interesting photographs and maps. We have noted errors in the latter which should have been avoided in a scientific journal.

—'A Foreign View of England in the Reigns of George I. and George II.' (Dutton) is a beautifully printed volume made up of letters written by M. César de Saussure to his family during the years 1725-1730. The translator, Madame van Muyden, gives us, in a preface of three pages, such essential facts regarding the author as are required to explain the character of this correspondence, and the general nature of the experiences out of which it sprang. M. de Saussure's father was a Huguenot exile resident at Lausanne, and the writer himself had seen nothing of the world until at the age of twenty he set out for England by way of Yverdon, Solothurn, Basel, and the Rhine. Until now the letters have remained in manuscript, but they seem to have been read rather widely at Bern, Geneva and Lausanne during De Saussure's lifetime. The most illustrious of their readers in the eighteenth century was Voltaire. When at Montriond, Lausanne, in 1755, he heard of them, and asked to see them. On returning them he sent a card with a message of thanks written in his own hand: "Monsieur de Voltaire et Madame Denis offrent leurs obéissances à Monsieur et Madame de Saussure, et renvoyent les manuscrits. On ne peut trop remercier Monsieur de Saussure de la bonté qu'il a eue de prêter un ouvrage si amusant et si utile." That this was not altogether the language of compliment will be the opinion of those who read the letters of De Saussure to-day. They depict English life as it was seen, more or less from the outside, by an intelligent and well-educated Swiss, who was shocked that the "profane and godless Woolston" had published a treatise against miracles, but felt deep admiration for English political institutions. In the eighteenth century Lausanne was already a home of primness and schoolmasters. There is something of the pedagogic air about De Saussure, although it is not unmixed with natural sprightliness. So far as can be seen from his letters, he did not move in court or official society, but he had very respectable friends in England. At one time he became first secretary to the British Embassy at Constantinople, and at another he was made secretary to Lord Cathcart, then commanding a portion of the British fleet in the war with Spain. The most valuable feature of these letters is their close observation of national eccentricities, or of those habits which to a foreigner must have seemed eccentric. It is the England of 'Tom Jones' and 'Roderick Random'—a coarser if not a more profligate England than that of 'The School for Scandal' and the Westminster Election. Madame van Muyden's translation is smooth and graceful.

—We must confess a certain initial feeling of prejudice against 'The True Napoleon' of Mr. Charles Josselyn (Russell), which is due to its question-begging title. This phrase—'The True Byron,' 'The True Shelley,' 'The True Napoleon,' etc.—has, however, grown so hackneyed during the past ten years that the day of its departure is surely close at hand. Mr. Josselyn does not seek to come at the truth by any process of criticism, by any examination of witnesses, by any test of veracity in the case of the memoir writers upon whom he relies. His leading authorities are Bourrienne, Las Cases, O'Meara, and other writers who had a sharp eye to the public, and were not afraid of seasoning their stories with the salt of Gascony when occasion required. We are quite sure that Mr. Josselyn has not been consciously unfair in his use of historical materials, but he is uncritical and plainly the amateur. The modesty of the preface is so disarming that we are relieved from trying this book by standards which would be applied to the works of Fournier and Rose—or even, let us say, to those of Mr. Watson and Miss Tarbell. "It is not my purpose," says Mr. Josselyn, "to write a life of Napoleon; this volume is simply a compilation of anecdotes and opinion incident to himself and his times, and like J. T. Headley, author of 'Napoleon and his Marshals,' I pretend to no originality, except that, like him, I have grouped what I believe to be interesting facts al-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ready known to the world, and have used without any hesitation any reliable author that could help me." As for the spirit in which these anecdotes are collected and arranged, it may be gathered from another passage of the preface. "That Napoleon had faults, was sometimes untruthful, cruel, even vicious, is admitted, but the good he performed, the great results he achieved, may possibly overbalance many of these unpleasant and bad qualities; and these, I think, in a great measure, are buried beneath his many noble deeds." The method pursued can be briefly indicated. Apart from a section on the chronology of Napoleon's life, there are five chapters which are devoted to the following subjects: "Boy and Man," "The Soldier," "Emperor and Statesman," "Exile and Philosopher," "The Man of the World." A lack of just perception in the choice of sources is the chief fault of this book, but it is not without other blemishes. The construction of sentences is sometimes defective, the subjects of the illustrations are not, as a rule, the best, and the most cursory glance reveals signs of carelessness. For example, the first line in the table of contents runs: "Napoleon: Boy and Man, 1767-1821," while the first sentence of the first chapter informs us that "Napoleon Bonaparte was born at Ajaccio, in Corsica, on the 15th of August, 1769." As partial compensation, the printing is good, and there is an accumulation of much entertaining gossip.

—'The Early History of Venice,' by F. C. Hodgson (Dutton), is a work of both coordination and research. As may be inferred from the title, it begins with the foundation of the city, and its closing episode is furnished by the share which the Venetians took in the Fourth Crusade. No writer on the origin of Venice or on any portion of its history can fail to accentuate the broad cosmopolitan character of the relations into which it was brought by its unique position, but there is room for either failure or success in the treatment of this theme. Mr. Hodgson shows skill in selecting the main lines of a complicated development, and, without sacrificing the local aspects of his subject, lets us see clearly how the town bore itself towards its Italian neighbors as well as towards the trading communities of the Levant. In all respects this must be considered a narrative history rather than a study of municipal and commercial institutions or of social life. In his notice of Venetian government and administration, Mr. Hodgson dwells strongly upon the absence of feudal instincts and influences. "If we turn," he says, "from the external aspect of the city of Venice to the political principles that prevailed there from the earliest days, we shall find that, perhaps more than any other of the states that formed the Western Europe of the Middle Ages, it embodied the ideas that had been bequeathed by the Roman Empire." It was by the route of Constantinople that the ideas of municipal government and of imperial majesty came to Venice, for the first doges were Byzantine officers who gained their appointment in days when the exarchate of Ravenna was still more than a name. Dealing chiefly, as he does, with events, Mr. Hodgson is led to emphasize the exploits of great leaders like Pietro Orseolo II. and Enrico Dandolo, and to pass lightly over those less palpable tendencies which are seized upon by the professed critic. We would not imply, however, that Mr. Hodgson is deficient in critical aptitude. His introduction gives proof alike of discriminating taste in the choice of authorities and of candor in avowing what he has not read. We are particularly glad to see that he has placed no reliance upon Daru, and that in using Gfrörer's 'Byzantische Geschichten' he is well aware of the author's bias against *Byzantinismus*. On the other hand, he seems less cordial towards Romanin than we could have wished. This is a scholarly and valuable book. It is also one which should prove attractive to mediævalists at large.

—Francisque Vial, author of 'L'Enseignement Secondaire et la Démocratie' (Paris: Armand Colin), knows just what his views are and how to give them clear expression. Clear minds, hearts filled with the spirit of justice, unanimity in high national and personal ideals, willingness to sacrifice the selfish interest of the present for the general good of the future—this is what must be cultivated in the masses of the French democracy to insure its success as a form of political and social organization. The masses must feel and act aright, and they must feel and act together. But their feelings and actions will inevitably be determined, in preponderating measure, by the character of the education which they receive. If they are to be at one in their feelings and actions, if there is to be a truly distinctive national spirit, they must be a unit in the educational influences to which they are subjected in the formative period. With the Utilitarian theory of education, however, unity is impossible. To be consistent with its fundamental principle, that theory must ever tend to greater and greater division. Egoism, intellectual and moral anarchy, a stolid indifference to the higher social and political interests and responsibilities, are its legitimate fruits. To the Liberal, and not the Utilitarian theory, then, France must look for the type of education which will satisfy the real needs of her democracy. And yet not to the Liberal teaching as it actually exists in the France of to-day. Liberal teaching itself has been caught in the flood of Utilitarianism and carried from its true foundations. It has gone from the general to the special, from principles to facts, adopting methods drawn from its enemies and foreign to its true character and aims. The author has the courage of his convictions sufficiently to take an actual programme of a course in the history of French literature, and set over against it such a programme as he would desire, in which the names of individual authors and other such narrowly specialized topics give way to the more general problems of literary evolution, with the understanding that the teacher is free to select the epochs, authors, and works best suited to throw light upon the problems under consideration. Neither the French democracy nor any other will guide its steps to any great degree in conscious deference to the reasonings of an educational philosopher; but M. Vial's book is none the less worth a careful reading, and may well have a deep influence on the inner circles of educational thought.

ROYCE'S WORLD AND THE INDIVIDUAL.

The World and the Individual. Gifford Lectures [on Natural Religion], Delivered before the University of Aberdeen. Second Series: Nature, Man, and the Moral Order. By Josiah Royce. The Macmillan Co. 1901. 8vo, pp. 480.

Professor Royce's second and concluding volume discusses questions of intimate interest to everybody. It is more persuasive than the first, of which it enhances the significance. The design of the whole now comes out—to introduce into the Hegelian philosophy of religion such rectifications as must result from recognition of scientific conceptions worked out during the century now completing itself since that philosophy first appeared. Of these new conceptions, some are psychological, some logical; but the chief of them are the new mathematical ideas which cluster about that of an infinite multitude. Mathematicians, perhaps, still linger on the stage, who, in their best days, used to be quite positive that one cannot reason mathematically about infinity, and used to feel, like the old lady about her total depravity, that, this cherished inability being taken away, the bottom would fall out of the calculus. Such notions are obsolete. Various degrees of infinity are to-day conceived with perfect definiteness; and the utter misapprehension of the metaphysicians about it, above all of Hegel, glares. As a first serious attempt to apply to philosophical subjects the exactitude of thought that reigns in the mathematical sciences, and this, not on the part of some obscure recluse whose results do not become known to the public, but on that of an eminent professor in a great university, to whom the world is disposed to listen with attention, Royce's 'The World and the Individual' will stand a prominent milestone upon the highway of philosophy.

Our space will permit only the most salient features of Professor Royce's theory to be roughly sketched. "An Idea is any state of mind that has a conscious meaning." In reference to meaning, logicians have never failed to recognize "quod fere in omnium ore celebre est, aliud scilicet esse quod appellativa [*i. e.*, adjectives] *significant*, et aliud esse quod *nominant*. Nominantur singularia, sed universalia significantur." So John of Salisbury, Abelard's pupil, expresses the distinction. That for the most important signs the signification is intrinsic, the denotation (*quod nominant*) extrinsic, is generally recognized. Professor Royce marks the distinction by the terms Internal Meaning and External Meaning. He conceives of the internal meaning in a special way. Another writer, a quarter of a century ago, proposed this maxim: "Consider what effects that might conceivably have practical bearings we conceive the object of our conception to have. Then our conception of those effects is the *whole* of our conception of the object." Carrying this pragmatistic spirit a trifle further, Professor Royce holds that the internal meaning of an idea is a Purpose, instead of regarding it, with his predecessor, as a germinal purpose. This purpose—obscurely recognized, since not all to which it will lead is foreseen; partially fulfilled in being recognized, since a purpose strives first of all to understand itself; but mainly unfulfilled, since it would not remain a purpose after fulfilment—is

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the internal meaning, or signification, or depth, of the idea. The purpose is vague—anything that refers to the future is more or less vague; and a sincere purpose to do a thing "right now" actually does it. The purpose is to do a thing under certain circumstances. Completely to define these circumstances, it would be necessary to give a biography of the purposer from birth, without any omission. The purpose is to do something in order to produce certain results. Completely to define the result accomplished must involve a complete representation of the agent's future life. In short, the complete fulfilment of any purpose, which alone is the external meaning of the idea, is no less than the entire life of the thinker. The reviewer will say, for clearness, that neither these nor the majority of the author's positions have been satisfactorily shown to be true (in the reviewer's opinion, but the author holds them to be perfectly demonstrated). The principal of them may rank as verifiable hypotheses possessed of the plausibility and other qualifications that render them eminently worthy of further examination, even if an engine of rare usefulness must be drawn away from other work for the purpose.

That the object of an idea, then, its external meaning, is of the nature of a sign could hardly be gainsaid. But Professor Royce finds it not only a sign but an idea; not only one idea but a "concrete" idea in the Hegelian sense, and that, not relatively, but perfectly, and so of the nature of life; and not only life, but an entire life. "The Being of the real object of which you now think, means a life that expresses the fulfilment of just your present plan."

But suppose the reader to ask, How can an idea, so microscopic a piece of a life, contain within its implication a distinct feature corresponding to every feature of the entire life of which it is only a part? This difficulty is happily removed by the author in a way which ought to be instructive to those metaphysicians whose horizon is limited by the walls of a theological seminary. He resorts to Gauss's conception of an *Abbild*, which has played a great rôle in mathematics. That is to say, he likens the idea representing the entire life to a map of a country lying upon the territory of that country. Imagine a map of England, absolutely perfect in its minutest details, to lie upon the soil of England, without covering the entire country it maps. Upon this map would be shown the very ground where the map lies, and the map itself, in all its minutest details. In this map of the map, the map will be shown again; and so on endlessly. Here, then, will be a part fully representing its whole, just as the implicit meaning of the idea is supposed to represent the entire life. It is to be noticed that, each successive map lying well inside the one which it immediately represents, unless there be a hole in the country which a ring-shaped map encloses, the endless series of maps will converge to a single point, which represents itself throughout each and every map of the series. In the case of the idea, that point would be the self-consciousness of the idea. An idea, being a state of mind with a conscious purpose, must evidently be self-conscious.

There, then, would seem to be a beautiful and a needed (though not a complete) confirmation of the aptness of the metaphor. Yet here the author recoils, and refuses to admit the continuity, or even the analytic continuity, of the map. He insists that no representation represents itself; a hard saying, which exact logic appears directly to refute. "The world of Self," he says, "whatever continuity of internal structure it may, in some aspects, possess, is, in its principal form of expression, embodied in a discrete series of . . . individual expression. . . . Experience at any moment shows how I am conscious of my . . . approaches to selfhood in any way in the form of a discrete series in which one stage . . . is followed by the next." The argument which supports this assertion is not assented to upon all hands. If it be true, there are but two alternatives: either, notwithstanding this, in the respects in which an idea represents an entire life there is continuity, or, at least, a higher infinity than that of the simple endless series; or else the doctrine that to an idea a reality must in some shape correspond must fall to the ground.

According to Professor Royce, an idea fails of being a Self only because it is general and not perfectly determined; which the reader may deem a dark saying unless the sword of Hegel is invoked to cut the knot. Its implicit or germinal inward meaning would, then, be a little Self, representing the entire life as its external meaning. In a similar way, the Self of the man is perhaps included within a larger Self of the community. On the other hand, the man's Self encloses intermediate selves—the domestic Self, the business Self, the better Self, the evil spirit that sometimes usurps his sovereignty. Of course, the system of delineation for the larger and for the enclosed selves will be different. Here the author draws support from the psychological doctrine of what he calls the "time-span," a doctrine which, so far as it has really been placed beyond important doubt, amounts to little more than that our image of the events of the few seconds last past is, or is very like, a direct perception, while our representation of what happened a minute or so ago is relatively of a far more mediate character. This phenomenon had already been seized upon by several idealistic writers as affording a refutation of dualism; but there is no better way of appreciating the large calibre of Royce's thought than by comparing their styles of putting this idea to the service of metaphysics with his. He imagines that the greater selves will naturally have vastly longer time-spans than the lesser selves. Now a consciousness whose time-span, or "specious present," or "empirical present," as it is variously called, was a thousandth of a second or a thousand years would not ordinarily be recognized as a consciousness at all by a human observer of its external manifestations. The time-span of the All-enclosing Self must cover all time; and this gives a sort of support to the imagination if we wish to reconcile foreknowledge and free will after the manner of Boëthius, St. Augustine, and others.

Every reality, then, is a Self, and the selves are intimately connected, as if they formed a continuum. Each one is, so to say, a delineation; with mathematical truth we may say, incongruous though the metaphor is, that each is a quasi-map of the entire field of all the selves, which organic aggregate is itself a Self, the Absolute Idea of Hegel. So far as a philosophical conception can be identified with God it is God.

All reasoning goes upon the assumption that there is a true answer to whatever question may be under discussion, which answer cannot be rendered false by anything that the disputants may say or think about it; and further, that the denial of that true answer is false. This makes an apparent difficulty for idealism. For if all reality is of the nature of an actual idea, there seems to be no room for possibility or any lower mode than actuality, among the categories of being. (Hegel includes modality only in his Subjective Logic.) But what, then, can be the mode of being of a representation or meaning unequivocally false? For Hegel, the false is the bad, that which is out of harmony with its own essence; and since, in his view, contradiction is the great form of activity of the world, he has no difficulty in admitting that an idea may be out of harmony with itself. Prof. Royce, however, seems almost to resent the idea that anybody could suppose that he denied the validity of the distinction of truth and falsehood. He is fairly outspoken in pronouncing sundry doctrines false (a word Hegel hardly uses), even if we do not quite hear his foot come down; and nothing does he hold more false than the usual form of stating the distinction now in question, namely, that a true proposition corresponds to a *real matter of fact*, by which is meant a state of things, definite and individual, which *does not consist merely in being represented (in any particular representation) to be as it is*. For example, if I dream that I find I can float in the air, this matter of dream is not matter of fact, for the reason that the only sense in which I can float in the air is that so my dream represented the matter. Now Prof. Royce offers to demonstrate by necessary reasoning that the statement—or, as he expresses it, that "to be real means to be independent of ideas which relate to that being"—is false. His argument to this effect will serve as a sufficiently characteristic, but rather favorable sample of his general style of argumentation.

Having given us to understand that he is going to disprove the proposition, he opens his argumentation by declaring that he does not know what the proposition means. Thereupon, he proceeds to propound a general maxim of procedure for all cases in which one has to refute a proposition without knowing what it means. It is to begin by assigning to it its "most extreme form." This certainly does not signify the most extremely defensible meaning, but rather the most extremely indefensible meaning that the language will bear. The proposition having been refuted in this extreme sense, it will only be necessary afterwards to argue that other interpretations make no essential difference. This maxim, one would suppose, would prove very serviceable to anybody who should have any large amount of that sort of refutation to perform. In accordance with this maxim, Prof. Royce begins by assuming that realists hold that no idea in the slightest degree determines the real object of it, whether causally or in any other manner. Whether this does not overstep the limits of admissible interpretation, seeing that a realist who

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

meant this would deny that any promise can really be kept, or that any purpose can influence the real result, the reader must say. At any rate, it would not seem to be a difficult position to refute.

Now in order that he may get the realist where he wants him, there are two acknowledgments which Professor Royce endeavors to extort from him. To bring him to the first, the author assumes the principle that all causal action is reciprocal, or of the nature of reaction. This is evidently contrary to popular opinion, which holds that while the past has exerted some efficient causality upon the future, the future cannot have any *effect*, in the strict sense of that word, upon the past; and that while the future may have influenced the past by final, or ideal, causation, the past cannot possibly influence the future as the aim of the future. The reader may judge whether a realist of so extreme a type as that which Professor Royce has set up would or would not admit that the real object of an idea cannot have influenced the idea, in the absence of any attempt on the part of Professor Royce to prove his general principle of reciprocity. If he would not, old-fashioned logic (which Hegelians, it is true, hold in high contempt) would pronounce the attempted demonstration to be a bald *petitio principii*.

In order to extract the second acknowledgment from the realist, Professor Royce produces an argument which would seem to have as much force for one kind of realist as for another. He supposes two objects, B and R, to be related to one another as the realist supposes the Being, or the real object of an idea, and the Representation, in the form of an idea of that object, to be related; and he undertakes to define the relation between them. "The definition in question," he says, "is, as a mere abstract statement, easy." One would think so. The realist simply says that B is not constituted by its being represented in R; that is, he says that the fact that B is as it is, would be logically consistent with R's representing it to be otherwise. But in place of this easily comprehensible relation, what fantastic attempt do we find at the definition that was pronounced to be so easy! Professor Royce will have it that the realist holds that the relation is such that no matter how R may be metamorphosed, it is logically possible for B to remain unchanged. In such a sense, what two things in the world are independent? Change the problematic madness of Hamlet into the pacification of the Philippines, and it will become logically inconsistent with the continuance of great disturbances there. But change the doubtful *representation* by Shakspere that the fictitious Hamlet was unhinged into the *representation* that the Philippines were pacificated in 1901, and it will not have the slightest logical consequence for the real state of things. The truth is, that Professor Royce is blind to a fact which all ordinary people will see plainly enough; that the essence of the realist's opinion is that it is one thing to *be* and another thing to *be represented;* and the cause of this cecity is that the Professor is completely immersed in his absolute idealism, which precisely consists in denying that distinction. It is his element, and there is total reflection at its surface. That, however, is what Professor Royce asks the realist to admit as a premise. The conclusion which he deduces from it is that if B is linked as cause to any determination of R, there must be a *tertium quid* by the mediation of which the causation takes place. Now the premise is absurd; and the formal rule is that from an absurd premise every conclusion must be allowed to be logical; that is to say, it is needless to dispute its logicality, the premise being false. The argument, therefore, cannot be called formally bad; nor can we object that a few lines below, in a restatement of the conclusion, B's being linked as cause gets changed into B's having any causal *or other* linkage.

Professor Royce, armed with his wrong definition of realism, goes on to a dilemma to show that, whether the realist says that real things are one or are many, he equally involves himself in contradiction. But although the characteristics of his style of argumentation become even more prominent in that dilemma, the exigencies of space forbid our following him further. But we should like to say one word to this powerful and accurate thinker who has been so completely led astray in his argumentation by his Hegelian logic: Absolute idealism depends, as Hegel saw that it did, upon assuming that position at the outset. If your refutation of realism is addressed to students who are already absolute idealists at heart, we will not undertake to say whether it will be serviceable for the development of that doctrine, or not. But if it is addressed to realists themselves, it must conform to the logical principles recognized by realists, or be nugatory. Now you know very well that realists do not admit that matter of fact can be apodeictically demonstrated. You ought to know, and surely you do know, that if you drive them into a corner, they will simply modify their admissions so far as may be necessary to avoid self-contradiction, and that from the very nature of apodeictic proof it is absolutely impossible to close off such escape in arguing about matter of fact. The history of the doctrine of parallels illustrates what logic shows to be necessarily the state of the case. But the question of realism is a question of hard fact, if ever there was a hard fact; and therefore your method must be revolutionized if you are ever to convince any master of logic.

SCHEIBERT'S SWORD AND PEN.

Mit Schwert und Feder: Erinnerungen aus meinem Leben. Von F. Scheibert, königlich-preussischem Major z. D. Berlin: Ernst Siegfried Mittler & Son; New York: Lemcke & Buechner. 1902.

Autobiographies are always interesting if written with candor and some literary skill, and if, in describing men, conditions, and events, they supply illustrative details not found in historical works. In what Major Scheibert presents to us he is candid enough, although his judgment and the accuracy of his information frequently appear very questionable. He went through the ordinary course of study in the Gymnasium, intending to devote himself to the study of architecture; but, discouraged by the poor prospects of advancement in that line, and by the "impressions made upon him by the commotions of the year 1848," he joined the military profession for the purpose of becoming an officer of engineers. He describes his career with some vivacity, and tells us of the clever things he did in peace and war, and of the credit he got for them from his superiors—some of them men of high rank and renown—with unconcealed satisfaction. But his success, so far as it consisted in official recognition of his merits, was far from being all he desired; for when he reached the dangerous "Major's Ecke" (the "major's corner")—that is, the rank in the military hierarchy from which the Prussian Government carefully selects those who are considered fit for the higher grades—he was dropped from active service and relegated to private station with a meagre pension not sufficient to support him and his family in comfort. According to his own account, he was a jolly companion among his fellow-officers, amusing them as well as himself with droll conceits and mirth-provoking pranks, which no doubt made his friends regret his unpropitious retirement. Pressed by poverty, he took to the writing of books, as he himself confesses, to keep the pot boiling; and, as a list appended to the present volume shows, he wrote twenty-five of them on all sorts of subjects connected with the military profession. To the necessity of writing so much may be owing the somewhat slipshod character of his literary style, and the abundant padding with matter of no consequence which is observable in the work before us.

Of special interest to American readers is that part of the autobiography which touches the author's experiences in our civil war. He was sent by his Government to America for the particular purpose of observing, on the occasion of the impending operations against Charleston, the utility of the new methods of protecting fortifications as well as ships with iron armor, and the effect produced by rifled cannon upon earthworks, masonry, and iron sheathings. It was the intention of his Government that to this end he should report himself at the headquarters of the Union forces; but as he believed he could observe things better from the inside of the attacked place, and as his sympathies were altogether on the side of the South, he was permitted at his own request to make his way to Charleston, not, indeed, as an emissary of the Government, but as a "private gentleman" and at his own risk. He succeeded in running the blockade on a British vessel, and put himself in communication with the military authorities of the Confederacy, who received him very kindly.

There being at the time nothing of great moment going on in or around Charleston, he betook himself to Virginia, where he was hospitably welcomed by Gen. J. E. B. Stuart, the famous cavalry leader, and subsequently by Gen. Lee himself. He was present at the battles of Chancellorsville and of Gettysburg, but the stories he tells add little, if anything, to the stock of our knowledge. His observations of men and events are of the most superficial kind, and he frankly confesses that his judgment is colored by his sympathies. He tells us that he began an address on our civil war which he delivered after his return home, with the words: "Gentlemen, if you expect to hear from me 'objective history,' you will be disappointed; I was heart and soul a Southerner. I can warm myself only for one cause." This characterizes all his stories as well as his reflections.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

As he loses no opportunity in his book to present himself as an ultra-royalist and an extreme conservative, who regards everything that smacks of free government with scorn, so he is easily convinced by a Southern clergyman that negro slavery was a very good thing for the blacks as well as the whites. He saw in the Southern army an organization of exceptionally God-fearing and brave men commanded by heroes, while the Northern army was, in his eyes, only a cowardly rabble led by blockheads and braggarts. There was, to him, no limit to the inexpressible contempt in which the Southern soldier held the mean-spirited Yankees. He found in the Southern troops not only more earnestness and temperament, but also more intelligence. He speaks even of the "indefinable difference" existing between a "people's army" in the true sense —meaning the Southern—and "troops raised by conscription," mercenaries, meaning the Northern army; being apparently ignorant of the fact that the Union army was, even more than that of the Southern Confederacy, mainly an army of volunteers—a "people's army" in the truest sense. He mentions with especial satisfaction that he was "joyfully welcomed" as a "Prussian," while the "Germans" were held throughout the Union in low esteem—mainly, as our author thinks, because the revolutionary movements of 1848 were still sadly remembered, and the Forty-eighters, thoroughly despised at home, were admitted to this country because our Government was—as we must infer, much to its regret—*obliged* to admit them. And now some of those despised Forty-eighters were, "to the astonishment of all sensible people," elected by their countrymen as military leaders. His disgust at this fact is so great that he repeats with evident relish the report attributing the Union defeat at Chancellorsville to the alleged misconduct of the German regiments. "To convince the reader," he says, "that I am not exaggerating, I quote here the report of a Union paper about the battle"; and then he quotes a sensational newspaper tale, the gross and unjust exaggerations of which have long been exposed and set right by historical criticism.

The Confederate defeat at Gettysburg was to Major Scheibert not a real defeat, but merely a miscarriage of a bold attack, after which the Union army might have met with an equally disastrous repulse had it been reckless enough to follow up its success. And so he goes on throughout. Returning to Charleston, he observed the operations of Gen. Gillmore, and formed the opinion that ironclad vessels are in a fight much superior to wooden ships, and able to run unharmed by land batteries; and that rifled guns have a very destructive effect upon masonry, but not upon well-constructed earth-works. On the whole, it appears from his own account that the Major may have brought home with him very entertaining tales of the American war, but very little information of real value, historical or other, unless we call valuable a report he gives of a conversation he had before leaving Virginia with the President of the Confederacy. It is worth quoting verbatim:

"I paid my respects to President Jefferson Davis," he says, "and was so cordially greeted by the head of the Confederacy that I saw in what manner Gen. Lee had spoken of me. The President made upon me a very strong impression. The genuine gentleman and Christian appeared in everything he said, as well as his zealous endeavor to keep the war within the limits of humanity. Like Lee, he showed himself a nature in complete equipoise. Posterity will pass upon this eminent statesman a judgment different from that of his strongly prejudiced contemporaries. At the close of the evening reception he took me into a private room, and, after we had thoroughly discussed the chances of the war, he requested me, when passing through Paris, if my time permitted it, to seek an audience with the Emperor Napoleon, and, as a military man by profession and a member of an entirely disinterested state, to explain to him the situation of things and the staying power of the Confederate army. 'If the Emperor,' he said in substance, 'delivers me of the blockade—and that he can do by a mere stroke of the pen—I guarantee to him the possession of Mexico. In 1842 [*sic*], with an army of about 12,000 men, we forced that state to submit to our will, our soldiers being accustomed to the climate and the mode of fighting of the Mexicans. We can do the same thing again at any moment, since the advantage gained by the raising of the blockade, which saps our vitality, would enable us to detach a corps of 12,000 to 20,000 men without feeling it much.' I promised to do what I could; but in Paris I received a pressing order from Prince Radziwill to come home; the short period of my stay in Paris was therefore not sufficient for me to go through all the diplomatic formalities which, even for a private gentleman, are connected with such an audience. But who knows how Providential it was that I could not discharge the highly important mission which I should have been glad to carry into effect!"

Had our author had his audience with the Emperor, he would no doubt have found that Louis Napoleon, who at heart would greatly have liked to break up our blockade, had reasons for abstaining from the attempt which the eloquence of this private envoy would not have been able to shake. But it is interesting to know that Jefferson Davis was ready to throw to the winds all reverence for the Monroe Doctrine which he may once have cherished, and actually to invite, with an offer of military aid, a European monarch to possess himself of an important part of the American continent.

The second half of the volume is devoted to the author's experiences in the Schleswig-Holstein war, in the war of 1866 between Prussia and Austria, in the Franco-German war of 1870, and in various garrisons. It gives entertaining and in great part pleasant pictures of army life, and the reader cannot but regret to see the once so jovial officer of engineers in his old age reduced to eking out a precarious existence by resort to literary drudgery.

An Onlooker's Note-Book. By the Author of 'Collections and Recollections.' Harper & Brothers. 1902.

Every one who read Mr. Russell's former book will welcome a second instalment of his wit and wisdom. In this case, wisdom has come to predominate over wit. The author deliberately preaches on certain texts, and moralizes much throughout his writing. The book is composed of papers which appeared in the Manchester *Guardian* during the year 1901, and the number of subjects treated, to judge from the titles of the homilies, is very great. But, with the exception of some historical essays, which throw light on the interior of the British Constitution, the subject really examined is that part of the population known as "society." Of this heterogeneous body Mr. Russell is himself a member by birth and by education, and he speaks from his own knowledge and observation. He is not a cynic, nor a pessimist. He has a kindly nature, and bears with him a broad mantle of charity. His tone is rather that of Horace than of Juvenal or Swift. He feathers his shafts with humorous anecdotes, and does not point them with malice. All the more startling and painful is his arraignment of the vices of a decadent age.

The more obvious vices of fashionable society, Mr. Russell says, are "its utter irreligiousness, its worship of money, its frantic extravagance, its indifference to all moral issues, its cynical absorption in pleasure and self-indulgence and self-seeking, its impatience of restraint, privacy, and decorum." Lord Melbourne, after listening with indignation to a sermon on Christian duty, exclaimed: "Things have come to a pretty pass when religion is allowed to invade the sphere of private life." His opinion is carried out in the practice of the "smart set." "It keeps the sphere of its private life absolutely free from the invading forces of religion." Sunday is completely secularized. What part of it is not devoted to exercise and games of chance is given to eating and drinking. The account which Mr. Russell gives of the food consumed by men and women of social position in England recalls the stories of the gluttony of the Romans under the early emperors. Of course, such life breeds parasites as a decaying carcass breeds maggots, and the description of the arts by which they get a start in their career, and force and beg their way on, would be entertaining were not the subject so repulsive. Society, as Mr. Russell paints it, consists largely of ignorant, superstitious, unscrupulous, and selfish people, living, or desiring to live, beyond their incomes, and trying to make up the deficiency by any expedient, fair or foul; gambling, speculating, and betting being the most common.

In one respect there has been an improvement. In spite of the incessant drinking, in which women participate, there is little open drunkenness. The quantity of liquor consumed is not less, but it is not so strong. And Mr. Russell takes pains to point out some wholesome forces which he is confident will some day renovate society. But, as a whole, the society which he describes is repulsive. We may laugh at it, as he tells us stories of its follies and its sins; but we would rather be entertained with a pleasanter subject. The influence of Queen Victoria was conservative and refining. If society degenerated during her reign, what will it become under a successor whose private life has been far from pure? Decorum has gone, manners are disappearing, chivalry is a name of the past, we hear no more of the "chastity of honor," for both words are old-fashioned.

After all, has there been a decadence? Thackeray depicted 'Vanity Fair,' half a century or more ago, when Mr. Russell was beginning to open his eyes, and he told us much the same story. He did not draw comparisons with a golden age; but the golden age of Mr. Russell must have been about the time when Thackeray was writing the 'Book of Snobs.' The vices of society have become more prominent, because wealth,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and with it luxury, have so greatly increased. The change in the system of travel is enough to account for the diminution of privacy. Parasites have not changed their nature since the time of Persius; and they increase in periods of luxury, as weeds flourish when the soil is enriched. Mr. Russell has unwittingly made his picture too lurid; his colors are stronger than he thinks, or laid on without regard to the effect of contrast.

The most instructive, if not the most entertaining, part of this book is that in which the claims of the English peerage to antiquity are scrutinized, and those of the House of Lords to political equality with the Commons are exploded. If aristocracy means the rule of the best, Mr. Russell says, we may safely affirm that it never existed in any place or at any time. The most virtuous men do not dominate their fellows. If aristocracy means the rule of the best born, then there is little of it in England; and of the special virtues of the English aristocracy, Mr. Russell says: "My firm conviction is that the less said about them, the better." After the battle of Tewkesbury, Disraeli observes, a Norman baron was almost as rare a being in England as a wolf is now.

"When Henry VII. called his first Parliament, there were only twenty-nine temporal peers to be found. . . . Of those twenty-nine, not five remain, and they—as the Howards, for instance—are not Norman nobility. We owe the English peerage to three sources—the spoliation of the Church, the open and flagrant sale of honors by the elder Stuarts, and the boroughmongering of our own times."

Every one knows what sort of people Charles II. made peers; and there were 108 peers created by the Stuarts. There are dukes and earls descended from William III.'s Dutch valets; but what of that if a Howard is a "hog-ward"? William Pitt added no less than 141 names to the peerage, and the process goes steadily on.

"Lord Salisbury conferred a peerage on a political supporter who was said by his detractors to have begun life as a 'bus-conductor, and by his friends to have been largely interested in a carriers' business. But he was understood to have paid ten thousand pounds to the party chest, and his money was as good as another's."

It might be well enough to make peers for life; but the House of Lords has succeeded, without much to countenance them, in establishing the principle that the King's writ, summoning a man to Parliament as a baron, "ennobles the blood." Nevertheless—and Mr. Russell writes as a Liberal—he declares that the House of Lords is, next to the crown, the most popular institution in the country. In this judgment and in those on the monarchy, which we can but mention as valuable, we are content to follow him. It is books like this that explain influences, ignored by the ordinary historian, but without knowledge of which history is unintelligible.

A Grand Duchess: The Life of Anna Amalia, Duchess of Saxe-Weimar-Eisenach, and the Classical Circle of Weimar. By Frances Gerard. E. P. Dutton & Co. 1902. 2 vols., pp. 582. With 42 illustrations and portraits.

In view of the dearth of English works upon Weimar as a whole and apart from the single life of Goethe, Miss Gerard's attempt is certainly worthy of recognition. How far it has actually succeeded in reproducing the substance and spirit of classic Weimar is another question. Whoever would treat thoroughly such a subject must have two preliminary qualifications; the first is a general knowledge of the political condition of Germany after the Thirty Years' War; the second is a sympathetic familiarity with the tardy growth of modern German art and letters. In neither of these lines can Miss Gerard be said to be truly at home. At more than one point her ignorance of general principles has betrayed her into misconceptions and even into misstatements. For instance, who that knows his German history would contrast "time-honored Göttingen" with "the more mushroom University of Giessen" (p. 153)? What student of German literature would call "Götz" "the product of a somewhat unhealthy sentimentalism" (p. 117)? Why speak of Mme. de Staël (p. 285) as a German? At page 190 we read that the Duchess Louise "had been educated in a school of strict propriety, such as then prevailed all over Germany." Yet (p. 291) we read of "foreign courts, and especially those of Germany, possessing a very low standard of morals." Had our author used the term "ceremony" or "etiquette," she would have spared her readers some *Kopfzerbrechen*. To mangle the words of Goethe's "Egmont" (pp. 205-206) is almost lese-majesty. We read (p. 506): "Goethe, at this period of his life, was absorbed in scientific studies, thus leaving unemployed those higher mental gifts which had been given him to use, not to bury." This is exploded conventionalism of the worst sort; it ignores Goethe's expressed declaration of the signal value of scientific study in *his own spiritual growth*. To translate "Die Mitschuldiger" by "The Culprits" (p. 318) is another ancient error.

At times the author's method is perplexing. Thus, her account of the *Tiefurter Journal* (p. 378, *seqq.*) is anything but lucid. The author has a trick of anticipating events, so that we read on page 403 of the patent of nobility conferred on Goethe in 1781, while on page 404 we read of the Swiss trip of 1779. The most provoking feature of the author's manner is her inveterate disposition to indulge in asides and superfluous comments. For example (p. 276), after quoting Merck's letter, in which he thanks Fate for having bestowed upon a poor wretch like him four weeks of golden days, our author adds: "Very nicely put, friend Merck." One must be a De Quincey, to pat one's friends on the back thus. We have not had the leisure nor the patience for adding up the number of times "the deadly parallel" has been drawn between the Weimar dames and the Girton girl; indeed, we have not always been certain which party was intended to be favored. At any rate, our view of comparisons is that of Mrs. Malaprop.

The book is carelessly put together. The note to page 49 refers us to an Introduction which nowhere appears. A like fate has befallen the portrait of Karl August at the age of eighteen, mentioned on page 172. On the other hand, we have an Appendix on the Grand Ducal Library not announced in the table of contents to volume II. Misprints, both English and German, abound; some of them obscure the meaning—for instance, the inscription on the Goethe house, opposite page 418. Some of the illustrations seem to us superfluous in a work upon Weimar.

Nevertheless, in spite of its faults, the work offers much reading that is pleasant and profitable. The author knows her Germany of to-day, and has caught enough of the old-time spirit to awaken our sympathy. It is pleasant to wander through old Weimar and Tiefurt, to awaken the echoes of the illustrious dead. It is worth the while to study the growth and fortunes of that truly great Duchess Anna Amalia, her trials and successes, her never-flagging vitality. It is especially valuable to have this study of a great woman by a woman. No man, however learned, could have entered so spontaneously into the spirit of Anna Amalia and her court. If we get the men of those days somewhat in the pettiness of their domestic foibles, that is only inevitable in the tableau. We should not forget that the great Weimar poet himself concluded his *magnum opus* with the observation: "Das Ewigweibliche zieht uns hinan." Thusnelda comes to her own, and Frau von Stein is heavily discounted; with this we are well content.

British Rule and Jurisdiction beyond the Seas. By the late Sir Henry Jenkyns, K.C.B. With a preface by Sir Courtenay Ilbert, K.C.S.I. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: H. Frowde. 1902.

Colonial Government: An Introduction to the Study of Colonial Institutions. By Prof. Paul S. Reinsch. The Macmillan Co. 1902.

To students of questions of public administration the "preface" contributed by Sir Courtenay Ilbert to Sir Henry Jenkyns's treatise will be as significant as the book itself. It is a biographical sketch of a man whom it would scarcely be an exaggeration to call an ideal civil servant. After a distinguished course at Oxford, supplemented by a brief period of practice at the bar, Jenkyns was appointed in 1869 to the post of Assistant Parliamentary Counsel. In 1886, on Lord Thring's retirement, he was promoted to that of Parliamentary Counsel. In February, 1899, he retired, and in December of the same year he died. He helped to draft the legislative measures of British Governments for thirty years, including Forster's Education Act and Ballot Act, the Army Act, Gladstone's Irish Church Act, Irish Land Act, and Home Rule Bills, the Local Government Acts, and Sir William Harcourt's Finance Act. His work was by no means mechanical. When called upon to prepare a bill, he would first make himself a complete master of the subject in all its bearings, would embody the results of his researches in an exhaustive memorandum, would discuss the proposals that had previously been made for the solution of the problem, and would suggest practical conclusions, indicating the arguments for and against each alternative course. There are in existence over sixty volumes of confidential papers containing these memoranda. Sir Henry Jenkyns's criticism was constructive as well as destructive, for he possessed the imagination which could forecast the actual working of any particular scheme. His services were rendered to the ministry of the day irrespective of party. Mr. Bryce describes the author of this volume as the most powerful arguer he ever knew; Mr. Balfour calls him "a most acute critic of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

other men's ideas, rich in suggestions of his own, with unrivalled experience and great legal knowledge"; Mr. Morley speaks of him as "a consummate master" of his work, and says that the only man in his experience at all comparable to Jenkyns in the difficult art of rapidly devising the right words for the bare rudiment and intention of a clause or an amendment was Herschell. But the possessor of these rare qualities was unknown, even by name, to the world at large. It was his conviction that a civil servant should keep in the background, and he therefore persistently refused to make any literary use, during his official career, of the vast mass of materials he had collected. The book now published was to have been the first fruits of his leisure. Its completion was arrested by his death, and his MSS. have been revised and supplemented by some of his friends.

The expectations induced by this introduction are not disappointed by a study of this treatise, unpretentious in form, but masterly in execution. The body of the work treats in turn of the various classes of territory under British jurisdiction, the relations between the home Government and colonial Governments, British possessions other than colonies, self-governing colonies, colonies not self-governing, colonial governors, extra-territorial jurisdiction, consular jurisdiction, jurisdiction in British protectorates, and the position of foreign subjects in them. There are eight appendices, mainly consisting of the full text of various important acts, commissions, etc. Every page bears traces of being the work of a lawyer, and in each discussion the author goes into many points of detail, with frequent footnotes; but the style is so clear that the lay reader need never be perplexed or bored. It carries the authority of full and accurate knowledge combined with wise judgment.

The chapters on "Self-governing Colonies" and "Colonial Governors" are of special value for the light they throw upon the processes of political development. Sir Henry Jenkyns lays great stress upon the distinction between representative and responsible government. From this point of view he disagrees with Professor Dicey's opinion that the Constitution of the Dominion of Canada is, in its essential features, modelled on our own, and maintains that, "even if we shut our eyes to the crucial distinction between parliamentary government and presidential government, the points of resemblance between Canada and the United States are not nearly so remarkable as the points of difference." In Canada the Ministers require the support and confidence of a majority of a popularly elected assembly, and are consequently responsible to it. Other differences lead to the conclusion that, "apart from the division of powers which is necessary in every federation, and the fixed proportion of the number of Senators from each province, it is difficult to specify any point of resemblance between the Government of Canada and that of the United States which is not also a point of resemblance between the former and the Government of the United Kingdom." The author thinks it especially necessary to emphasize Ministerial responsibility as a fundamental characteristic of the British self-governing colonies, because it is not to be discovered by an examination of their "instruments of Constitution," and is therefore likely to be overlooked by students who obtain their data mainly from Acts of Parliament or Orders in Council.

Professor Reinsch's book, as its title suggests, is of a more popular type than Sir Henry Jenkyns's, and covers the sphere of colonial government in general, though naturally the British colonies receive the principal share of attention. It is excellently adapted to its purpose, for it presents with admirable lucidity of style and arrangement a survey of the motives and methods of colonial expansion, an account of the general forms of colonial government, and an outline of administrative organization and legislative methods. While it does not avowedly appeal to specialists, they will do well not to neglect it, for the most familiar principles are freshly stated, with new illustrations from quite recent history, and it contains not a few suggestions that will be read with interest by persons already well acquainted with the literature of the subject. The bibliography appended to each chapter will be of service to all classes of readers. The present book bears closely upon practical politics, for its author, without therein ceasing to be scholarly, keeps present-day problems always in mind, and pays due attention to such modern questions as the commercial relations between mother country and colonies, the influence of capitalistic combinations upon colonial expansion, "spheres of influence," and the British agitation for imperial federation.

The corrections required are comparatively unimportant. The view taken of the position of a British Governor (p. 247) is too optimistic to suit present conditions. In the list of distinguished colonial governors (p. 249) a place should have been found for Sir George Grey, one of the greatest of them all. The statement that "the colonial governments are always consulted before any important step involving their interests is taken" (p. 242) conveys an erroneous impression. If the representations of the Ministries of Cape Colony and Natal in the summer and autumn of 1899 had not been ignored by the High Commissioner and the home Government, the Transvaal war would have been avoided. Lord Grenville (pp. 149 and 382) should be Lord Granville; S. W. Rusden (p. 275) should be G. W. Rusden; and Spriggs (p. 385) should be Sprigg. It is a mistake to say that most of the first-class clerks in the Colonial Office entered the service as second-class clerks (p. 289). In connection with the relation of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council to questions of Indian law (pp. 350 and 373), it should have been mentioned that this Committee always includes at least one member who has had legal experience in India itself. Lord Hobhouse, for instance, was for five years a legal member of the Governor-General's Council, and Sir Richard Couch sat for nine years on the bench of the High Court, first at Bombay, and later at Calcutta.

The Boer Fight for Freedom. By Michael Davitt. Funk & Wagnalls Co. 1902.

At the outbreak of hostilities in the Transvaal, in October, 1899, Mr. Davitt resigned his seat in the House of Commons and repaired to the seat of war, there to spend the next six months in obtaining from the Boer leaders their representation of the occasion and conduct of the contest. After May, 1900, his material seems to be drawn from the sources of information which are accessible to the general reader of current newspaper and official discussions, and altogether derives such value as it possesses from the author's reports of conversations upon controverted subjects with the officers of the Boer armies. Mr. Davitt's well-known attitude, as an Irish patriot, towards the British Government should prepare the reader to expect a passionate criticism of the motives, humanity, and modes of fighting of the English, and an equally ardent vindication of the disinterested love of liberty and justice of the Dutch republics. The book is entitled to a place among the collections of fact and belief which have already constituted a voluminous basis for that impartial history which shall some day emerge from the contradictory mass of materials.

The military student will be interested in what is said of the relative numbers of combatants in battle, as well as in the attempt to compare the aggregate forces of the opposing nations. That the Boers, with a handful of troops, constantly thwarted the plans of veteran British generals, and repeatedly captured, from an easily bewildered marching column, prisoners exceeding in number the assailants, has been confessed with chagrin by historians from the English side. In our American civil war, Forrest and Wheeler were masters in the audacious tactics which impressed upon train escorts the belief that a few noisy assailants were an overwhelming host, and the Boer burgher was upon his native heath in the pursuit of armed Englishmen, as he had stalked wild men and beasts over the same ground. Paradoxical as it seems, the strength of the Boers lay in their ignorance of military traditions. New occasions teach new duties in warfare as in peace, and, these farmer folk being without time for drill, and, as compared with the resources of their opponents, poor in arms and the other implements of warfare, it behooved them to adapt themselves to the condition of attack and resistance which every man's own intelligence, long disciplined in much the same emergencies, showed to be most promising. In short, the Boer was called upon to act in precisely the manner in which the Americans at Lexington and Bunker Hill, or Jackson's men at New Orleans, held their own against masses of veteran troops. Hence the Boer was extremely individual in his performance of military duty, now and then to the discomfiture of his own superiors; very mobile and venturesome; and, as officer or private, used common sense to override, if need be, all precedents of military propriety and order.

Mr. Davitt enters into elaborate calculations to show the great disparity of the aggregates of the opposing armies. The British, he says, had above 388,000 men, while the Boers mustered at most 31,500, and of actual fighting men, but 27,500. But he allows that some 5,000 of the Boers died in service, and Lord Kitchener has declared that 17,000 men have laid down their arms since the treaty of peace; and, adding to these the captives already in camps of detention, the more likely figure will seem to be at least 50,000 Boers in arms. To be sure, the entire estimated population of the colonies drawn upon for this army is

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

only 220,000 or 230,000, but boy and graybeard, to the last male capable of firing a gun, appear to have swelled the ranks. An attempt was indeed made by the Boer Government to keep an accurate record of enlistments by the system of identification-cards to be carried each by a man with a corresponding number on file in the War Department; but in popular uprisings systems of registration are little to be depended upon.

Lee at Appomattox, and Other Papers. By Charles Francis Adams. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1902. Pp. 387.

Of the five pieces included in this collection, all have previously, in one shape or another, seen the light and been more or less widely commented upon, in our columns as elsewhere. The brief title-paper accords to Lee especial honor for perceiving that the cause for which the South had fought was lost, and for preventing, by honorable surrender, the prolongation of the struggle through resort to such methods as those which characterized the last year of the recent war in South Africa. The South African situation, indeed, has particular interest for Mr. Adams, and furnishes material for drawing a number of instructive historical parallels. The paper entitled "An Undeveloped Function," originally prepared as a presidential address for the American Historical Association, does not become more convincing on a second reading, but it is nevertheless a breezy, stimulating call to the historian to instruct and mould the public opinion of his generation, and contribute to the solution of present problems, rather than to content himself with adding to the store of information about the past. Taken as a whole, the volume before us is a good illustration of Mr. Adams's powers as a historian. He has command of his material, and is always readable. Principally, however, one notes the definiteness—at times, the aggressiveness—of his opinions, and the consequent freshness and vigor of much of his discussion. It is the downright expression of a well-equipped student, never obtrusive or brusque, and not always carrying conviction, but carefully fortified, interesting, and every way worthy of attention.

The longest and most important paper in the volume is that on the Treaty of Washington, being the substance of four lectures delivered in December, 1901, in the Lowell Institute course in Boston. Aside from the merits of the paper as a careful narrative of events, particularly those immediately preceding and those resulting from the treaty, Mr. Adams's account is notable because of the discussion which its estimate of Sumner, and especially its justification of the removal of Sumner from the chairmanship of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, has called out. In the paper, as now printed, Mr. Adams goes over again in an appendix the objections of his critics—particularly those of ex-Gov. D. H. Chamberlain—but without surrendering anything of his own position. In Mr. Adams's opinion, the San Domingo affair was only the remote, and not the immediate, cause of Sumner's displacement; the real occasion was Sumner's opposition to the policy of the Administration in the pending negotiations with Great Britain, and the personal hostility between him and the President and Secretary of State. Under such circumstances—and this is the main point of controversy—Mr. Adams is clear that the necessity of harmony between the Senate and the President in treaty matters justifies the latter in bringing about, if he can, a change in the head of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, as was done by Grant in the case of Sumner. The insistence upon this view, which is elaborated at some length, as the only working theory on which the President and the Senate could have proceeded, or could be expected to proceed again under similar circumstances, illustrates the essentially practical habit of Mr. Adams's historical and legal reasoning. The question is, of course, somewhat one of opinion, but the friends of Sumner are hardly likely to allow Mr. Adams the last word, or to fail to point out the striking consequences which would ensue if the precedent established in Sumner's case were given general application.

Finland As It Is. By Harry de Windt. E. P. Dutton & Co. 1902. 8vo, pp. xii., 316. Illustrated.

The author tells us that this book was written with the understanding that it might serve as a guide to tourists. With that in view, a brief vocabulary (in which such fundamental words as *good* and *fire* are not to be found) and a list of desirable hotels, physicians, and druggists in the chief towns, are added as appendices. We miss in the volume the business-like method of a guide-book, with its carefully classified information, and do not find anything which seems well adapted to take its place. Conditions have altered so, since the book was written, that even the few hints which are given may be less useful now. The only feature which one might rely on finding unaltered, except as intensified, is the resentment against Russia which the author frequently refers to, and which one would think the censor would be apt to blot out of volumes to be sold in St. Petersburg. Regarding the book as merely the narrative of a trip of a lively newspaper man to a country with which he was entirely unfamiliar, we have less to criticise. Little known as Finland is to the average reader, this journal gives a superficial but interesting account of how the country appears to a tourist, of the unexpected prosperity and even wealth of a people with relatively slender resources, but which furnishes England with the greater part of what sells as "Danish" butter and "Stockholm" tar; besides the less notable supplies of wood-pulp paper and fir timber.

The illustrations are numerous and exceptionally good, especially the photographic half-tones; and the book will serve a useful purpose in familiarizing English and American readers with the characteristics of that country which the natives call Suomi, and the rest of the world knows as the Grand Duchy of Finland.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Bailey, M. A. High School Algebra. American Book Co. 90 cents.
Gordy, J. P. Political History of the United States, Vol. 2. H. Holt & Co. $1.75.
Moore, A. W. The Alps in 1864: A Private Journal. Edinburgh: David Douglas.
Pinney, Aida E. Spanish and English Conversation. 2 books. Boston: Ginn & Co. 60 cents each.
Roddy, H. J. Complete Geography. American Book Co. $1.
Stevenson, J. H. Assyrian and Babylonian Contracts. American Book Co.
The Temple Bible: (1) The Gospel according to St. Luke, edited by M. R. Vincent; (2) The Book of Daniel and the Minor Prophets, edited by R. Sinker. London: J. M. Dent & Co.; Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co. 60 cents each.

JUST PUBLISHED:

SEIGNOBOS' FEUDAL RÉGIME.

Translated and edited by Prof. EARLE W. DOW, of the University of Michigan. 70 pp., 8vo, paper. 50c. *net.*

This notable monograph, originally contributed to Lavisse and Rambaud's "Histoire Générale," has been pronounced by authorities to be perhaps the most illuminative work on its subject.

PROF. SEIGNOBOS' POLITICAL HISTORY OF EUROPE SINCE 1814 ($3 *net*) is now in its third impression, and his **ROMAN PEOPLE** ($1.25 *net*) has just been published.

Henry Holt & Co.,

29 W. 23d St., New York. 378 Wabash Ave., Chicago.

American Traits

From the Point of View of a German.

By **HUGO MUNSTERBERG**

HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN & CO., Boston and New York.

Seven Roman Statesmen of the Later Republic:

The Gracchi, Sulla, Crassus, Cato, Pompey, Cæsar.

By CHARLES OMAN, M.A., Deputy Professor of Modern History at University of Oxford, Author of "A History of Greece," etc. With Portraits and Illustrations. Crown 8vo $1.60.

LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO.,
Publishers, New York.

ASK FOR
CROWELL'S POETS

Chickering Pianos

The OLDEST *in* AMERICA;
THE BEST *in the* WORLD

WRITE FOR CATALOGUE

Chickering & Sons

PIANO FORTE MAKERS
BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS

REMINGTON
Standard Typewriter
327 BROADWAY, NEW YORK

EDWIN LAWRENCE GODKIN.—Japan proof of Portrait, engraved on wood in the highest style of the art, sent, charges paid, on receipt of five dollars ($5) by GUSTAV KRUELL.
331 Main Street, East Orange, N. J.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED